REPORT RESUMES

ED 002 813 24
MOTIVATIONS OF YOUTH FOR LEAVING SCHOOL.
BY- BOWMAN, PAUL H. MATTHEWS, CHARLES V.
CHICAGO UNIV.
REPORT NUMBER CRP-200 PUB DATE SEP 60
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$6.40 160P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DROPOUT IDENTIFICATION, *HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, *EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE, SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS, LOW ACHIEVERS, *ACADEMIC FAILURE, RETARDATION, PEER RELATIONSHIP, *VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, FEMALE, MALE, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THE OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY WERE (1) TO IDENTIFY THE CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOL DROPOUTS AS CONTRASTED WITH THOSE WHO STAYED IN SCHOOL, (2) TO INVESTIGATE EXPERIENCES WHICH LED TO LEAVING SCHOOL, (3) TO DETERMINE THE PERCEPTIONS OF SCHOOL-LEAVERS REGARDING THEIR SCHOOL EXPERIENCES, AND (4) TO INVESTIGATE WHAT SCHOOL-LEAVERS DID AFTER THEY LEFT SCHOOL AND HOW SUCCESSFUL THEIR ADJUSTMENT WAS TO THE ADULT WORLD. DROPOUTS WERE DIVIDED INTO EARLY, MIDDLE, AND LATE GROUPS AND COMPARED USING INTELLECTUAL, SOCIAL STATUS, AND PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT MEASURES. ALTHOUGH THERE WAS A CONSISTENT TREND INDICATING THAT THE EARLY DROPOUTS WERE OF LOWER INTELLIGENCE, LOWER SOCIAL STATUS, AND INFERIOR PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT, THE ONLY DIFFERENCE FOUND TO BE STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT AT BETTER THAN THE 5-PERCENT LEVEL WAS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EARLY MALE DROPOUTS AND ALL LATE DROPOUTS ON SOCIAL STATUS. REASONS GIVEN BY DROPOUTS WERE THAT THEY DID NOT SEE EDUCATION AS A MEANS TO PRACTICAL ENDS, THAT THEY DID NOT VALUE EDUCATION IN ITSELF, AND THAT THEY FELT REJECTED BY AND REJECTED THE SCHOOL. IN CONTRAST THE CONTROL STUDENTS VALUED EDUCATION AS "GOOD IN ITSELF" AND AS THE ONLY PATHWAY TO VOCATIONAL SUCCESS. THE DROPOUTS ALSO REPORTED THAT A MAJORITY OF THEIR PARENTS WERE EITHER INDIFFERENT TO OR TOOK NO ACTIVE INTEREST IN THEIR CONTINUING IN SCHOOL. THE PARENTS OF THE CONTROL STUDENTS WERE ACTIVELY INTERESTED IN THEIR CHILDREN STAYING IN SCHOOL. THE STUDY RECOMMENDS INCREASED SCHOOL GUIDANCE AND BETTER GROUPING OF STUDENTS (JL)

ED002813

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

MOTIVATIONS OF YOUTH FOR LEAVING SCHOOL

Cooperative Research Project No. 200

by

Paul H. Bowman
Charles V. Matthews

University of Chicago
Quincy Youth Development Project
Quincy, Illinois
Chicago, Illinois

September 1960

The Research Reported Herein was Performed Pursuant to a Contract with The U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

See Page 85

ABSTRACT

It is true that approximately 40 percent of American youth do not complete their high school education despite our significant gains in the quantity and quality of free public schools since the turn of the century. During the same period the labor market has raised the age for entry into most secure vocations to eighteen years. The resulting gap of two to three years in the lives of the students who leave school before graduation has serious effects upon the personal, social, and vocational adjustment of the individuals concerned as well as for the nation.

Many research studies have provided a wealth of descriptive information concerning the typical dropout student. The early school leaver is consistently found to be of low social status, below average intelligence, an adademic failure, often absent from school, and more often retarded. However, few of these studies have utilized data collected prior to the dropout situation with research objectives in view.

This study utilizes longitudinal data collected over an eight year period on an age group of children by the Quincy Youth Development Project. It attempts to answer the following questions: What children drop out of school? What characteristics of these children distinguish them from those who stay in school? What experiences of theirs lead to school leaving? How are dropouts seen by their peers, their teachers, and themselves? What do they think of their school experience? What do they do after leaving school, and how well do they do it? The following hypotheses are stated in brief.

1. More boys than girls will drop out of school.
2. The dropouts will have lower intellectual ability than stayins.
3. Family socioeconomic status of the dropouts will be lower than class average.
4. The dropouts will be inferior to a control group matched on age, sex, intelligence, and social status with regard to:
    a. Personal and social adjustment
    b. School adjustment
    c. Work adjustment
    d. Marital adjustment
    e. Achievement values and aspirations

5. Those students dropping out of school at an early age will be lower on ability, personality, and social status measures than those dropping out at later ages.

All of the above hypotheses were accepted except number one, which was rejected for this population, and number five, which was rejected for all groups in this population except the early dropout boys, a group significantly lower in social status than either late dropout boys or girls.

The population of this study consisted of 487 children who were in the potential graduating class of 1958 in the Quincy Public Schools. Of this group 55 moved out of the community and records of their future school progress could not be maintained. This left an effective population of 432. One hundred and thirty eight dropped out of school before reaching the graduation date for the class, a dropout rate of 31.4 percent.

All dropouts were interviewed six months after dropping out of school concerning their reasons for dropping out of school, adjustment to school, vocational history, and future plans. Additional data regarding the dropouts were obtained from the Quincy Youth Project's case records on each student, the school cumulative records, a survey of church affiliations, questionnaires, and employer interviews. The following is a list of the variables studied and the instruments used to measure them:

Variables		Instrument
Intelligence	-	V, S, and R Scales of the Chicago Primary Mental Abilities
Social Status	-	Index of Status Characteristics (ISC) Developed by Warner [22]
Personal and Social Adjustment	-	California Personality Inventory California Test of Personality "Who Are They" Sociometric Test "Behavior Description Chart"

School Adjustment		California Reading Achievement Test Years of retardation Attendance records School grades Interview data "Junior High Activities Inventory"
Work Adjustment	-	Employer rating interview Length of job Work adjustment rating Rating of job category
Marital adjustment	-	Marital adjustment rating
Achievement values	-	Semantic differential Parental Attitudes

It was recognized in the planning of the research design that sex, intelligence, and social status were major variables characteristic of dropouts. Therefore, the dropouts were matched with two control groups selected from the stayin population separately for intelligence and social status. The dropouts could not be matched individually on intelligence and social status so the matching was done using cells of intelligence plotted against social status. One hundred and twenty seven controls were so selected, 101 matched for social status, and 111 matched for intelligence.

The dropouts left school at ages ranging from fourteen to eighteen with the greatest number leaving between sixteen and sixteen and a half years. They left school as early as grade seven and as late as one month before completing their twelfth year. The modal number left in the ninth grade with grades nine, ten, and eleven accounting for 83 percent of the dropouts.

Dropouts were found to score significantly lower on measures of social status and intelligence than all stayin students. 1

Dropouts were divided into early, middle, and late groups and compared using intellectual, social status, and personal and social adjustment measures. 100 Although there was a consistent trend indicating that the early dropouts were of lower intelligence, lower social status, and inferior personal and social adjustment, the only difference found to be statistically significant at better than the 5 percent level of confidence was the difference between early boys and all late dropouts on social status. 154

Although more boys dropped out than girls this difference was not found to be significant either statistically or functionally.

Differences were also found between dropouts and controls on various socio-economic factors either factorial to, or separate from the Index of Status Characteristics[22] used to equate the two groups. Dropouts lived in larger percentages in homogeneous low status sections of the city. They attended elementary schools in these same areas in larger percentages than did controls. While only a few dropouts left school because of the absolute necessity to work, ~~many~~ still fewer of them, as compared with their control groups, were self-supporting while in school, at the time of the interview six months after leaving school, and at the time of the followup in 1960. In regard to both part-time jobs while in school and initial jobs obtained after leaving school, the dropout obtains a poorer job initially, holds it for a shorter period of time, and makes a poorer record than do the controls.

Dropouts more frequently come from larger families and are less frequently first-born, or only children than controls.

The combined dropout and control group was below the class average on measures of social and personal adjustment. The dropouts were compared with the control groups using the three way analysis of variance method and found to score lower on the following subscales of the California Personality Inventory at better than the 5 percent level of confidence.

Capacity for Status
Socialization
Communality
Responsibility
Intellectual Efficiency
Achievement via Conformance
Achievement via Independence

Some few, notably Communality and Achievement via Independence, of these main effects were obscured by interactions with intelligence or social status, but dropouts differed significantly from controls on two of the three classes of subscales found on the CPI and on the total score.

Dropouts were not differentiated from the controls by the sociometric choices of their peers or the ratings of their teachers in the sixth grade in elementary school. However, both peer choices and teacher ratings did pick out the dropouts at the ninth grade level in junior high school. At this level both peers and teachers saw the potential dropout as lacking leadership characteristics. In addition, students saw their potential dropout class mates as lacking friendship qualities, and teachers saw some of the potential dropouts as aggressive.

Dropout girls tended to marry very early and these marriages were not as successful as the later marriages of the control group. Over two-thirds of the dropout girls were married before age eighteen and only one-fifth of these marriages were rated above average. In contrast five-sixths of the control marriages were rated above average at the same time. Dropout boys also tended to make unsuccessful marriage partners, although they married in lesser percentages than dropout girls.

The personal values of dropouts and controls regarding concepts thought to be associated with school persistence were measured using the Semantic Differential. Dropouts viewed self, father, and school as less valuable than did controls. They also saw self and school as less industrious than did controls. These findings indicate that the control students value school and their own role in the school situation while the dropouts have rejected school and their role in it. Of questionable meaning is the finding that dropouts view competition as more active. This could indicate, in view of their rejection of school (which they saw as industrious), that they are rejecting school as too active.

Dropouts entered school at an older age than did controls and were retarded four times as often. Dropouts received lower marks throughout their school career than did controls, and were retarded in reading ability to a greater degree than controls matched either for intelligence or social status. Dropouts did make some progress in reading ability through the primary years but fell behind in the intermediate years and were severely retarded by junior high school. The attendance of the dropout student became progressively worse from the primary grades through high school and was far below that of controls. After tne ninth grade over 70 percent of the dropouts fell in the bottom quartile in school grades as compared with only 8 percent of the controls.

Dropouts participated in fewer extra curricular activities and also participated less intensively than did controls. Over two-thirds of the dropout group disliked school and both the dropout and control groups markedly rejected the junior high school as a preferred school although controls, in large majority, liked their total school experience. However, over half of the dropouts indicated that, if they had it to do over again, they would remain in school.

The self reports of the dropouts indicated their main reasons for dropping out of school were:

	Percentages
1. Just didn't like	21
2. Academic failure	20
3. Poor social adjustment	18
4. To work, poor finances	16

5. Pregnancy	9
6. Teachers unfair	6
7. Others	10
	100%

In contrast the reasons given by controls for staying in school were grouped as follows:

1. Get better job	32
2. Never had any other idea	14
3. Parental guidance	13
4. Just liked school	9
5. Need all the education you can get, must to enter college	14
6. Wanted high school diploma	6
7. Others	12
	100%

The reasons given by the dropouts indicate that they do not see education as a means to practical ends, that they do not value education in itself, and that they feel rejected by, and have rejected, the school. In contrast the control students value education as a "good in itself" and as the only pathway to vocational success. The dropouts also reported that a majority of their parents were either indifferent to, or took no active interest in their continuing in school. The parents of the controls were actively interested in the school persistence of their children.

Very few dropout children were found to be associated with the churches of the community as compared with the controls, and those that were church attenders were less active.

The findings of this study have implications for the administration and curriculum of public education. A school counseling program directed specifically at the potential dropout student could identify the potential dropout in the intermediate grades. This counseling program should extend from this point through high school graduation. Guidance in sexual adjustment, marriage, and family living for girls, and counseling for vocational adjustment for boys are of prime importance. Curricular adjustments should be made at the primary level for the student who does not readily master basic skills. Vocational education and work-experience education are the only alternatives for some potential dropout students. It is implied by the findings of this study and the authors' assessment of the current educational philosophy that administrators of public education need to give wider acceptance to the principle of grouping for individual differences and to the extension of guidance services both in intensity and to lower grade levels than is presently done. Churches, welfare agencies, courts, and the general public could do much simply by understanding the problem of the potential dropout and accomodating their programs and activities to him where possible.

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the aid of the Quincy Youth Development Project and the C. A. Moorman Foundation with whose support it was created, of the Quincy Public Schools, of the U. S. Office of Education, and of the following colleagues on the University Faculty who have contributed in many ways to this study: Gordon P. Liddle, James V. Pierce, Duff Tucker III, Robert J. Havinghurst, and Benjamin D. Wright.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. THE PROBLEM 1

II. REVIEW OF RESEARCH 3

III. OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES 9

IV. DESIGNS AND PROCEDURES 11

V. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 15

1. How Many Dropped Out? 15
2. When Did They Drop Out? 15
3. Comparison of Dropouts and Stayins 21
4. The Control Group 24
5. Socioeconomic Differences of Droputs and Controls . . . 25
6. Personality Adjustment, Dropouts and Controls 31
7. School Adjustment, Dropouts and Controls 36
8. Work Experience, Dropouts and Controls 48
9. Marriages, Dropouts and Controls 53
10. Reasons for Dropping or Staying in School 56
11. Parental Attitudes. 62
12. Personal Values--Semantic Differential Data 64
13. Analysis of Variance Data 69
14. Dropout Church Affiliation 83

VI. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS 85

APPENDICES 107

A. Interview Schedules 109

B. Questionnaire Schedules 115

C. Test Instruments 122

D. Rating Instruments 132

BIBLIOGRAPHY 135

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Progress Through School of the Total Population 16

2. Age at Time of Dropping Out of School 17

3. Grade Placement at Time of Dropping Out of School 17

4. Comparison of Early, Middle, and Late Dropouts on Ability, Personality, and Status Measures 19

5. Distribution by Sex of Dropouts and Stayins 21

6. Dropouts and Stayins by Intellectual Quartiles 22

7. Dropouts and Stayins by Socioeconomic Status 24

8. Socioeconomic Area of Residence of Dropouts and Their Controls . 27

9. Percentages of Dropouts and Controls and Elementary School of Origin by Status Level of the School 27

10. Size of Family for Dropouts and Controls 30

11. Birth Order of Dropouts and Controls 30

12. California Test of Personality Scores of Dropouts and Controls by Sex 32

13. California Psychological Inventory Scores of Dropouts and Controls by Sex 32

14. Percentage Distributions of Sentence Completion Test Ratings of 45 Dropouts and 105 of Their Controls 35

15. School Retardation for Dropouts, Controls, and All Stayins . . . 37

16. Grades of Dropouts During High School 40

17. High School Grade Point Average of Controls and Dropouts 40

18. Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities by Dropouts and Controls 42

19. School Absences of Dropouts and Controls 43

20. Job Categories of Dropouts and Their Controls 50

21. Work Adjustment Ratings of Dropouts and Controls 50

22. Additionsl Indications of Work Adjustment 52

Table Page

23. Age of School Dropouts and Age of Marriage 55

24. Ratings of Marital Success of Dropouts and Their Controls . . 55

25. Attitude Toward Education of the Parents of Dropouts and Controls 63

26. Means, Standard Deviations, Standard Errors, and P-Values for Control vs. Dropout Student Groups on Semantic-Differential Concepts 66

27. Means, Standard Deviations, Standard Errors, and P-Values for Control vs. Dropout Boys on the Semantic-Differential Concept School 67

28. Means, Standard Deviations, Standard Errors, and P-Values for Control vs. Dropout Girls on the Semantic-Differential Concepts Father and School 67

29. Means, Standard Deviations, Standard Errors, and P-Values for Dropout Boys vs Dropout Girls on the Semantic-Differential Concept School 68

30. Summary of Three Way Analyses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins; High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC for the California Psychological Inventory 78

31. Summary of Three Way Analyses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins; High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC for the California Psychological Inventory 79

32. Summary of Three Way Analyses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins; High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC for the "Who Are They" (1955 Administration) 80

33. Summary of Three Way Analses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins; High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC for the Behavior Description Chart (1952 Administration) 81

34. Summary of Three Way Analyses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins; High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC for the Behavior Description Chart (1955 Administration) 82

35. Church Affiliations of Dropouts and Controls 84

36. Schedule of Factor Identification for the Dropout Prone Student. 101

MOTIVATIONS OF YOUTH FOR LEAVING SCHOOL

Paul H. Bowmen
Charles V. Matthews

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

It is no new phenomena to discover that many students leave high school before graduation. At the turn of the century approximately 85 to 90 percent of high school students dropped out of school before completing it. During the last half century this percentage has been cut about in half as a result of the effort of the American Educational system to provide education for all of the children. During this same period of time the avenues to adulthood that were open to youth have changed considerably. During the first quarter of this century a person who dropped out of school before graduation still had many job opportunities open to him that could lead to advancement and success. Today there are relatively few career opportunities without a high school education.

There seems to be little question that social acceptance and social adequacy in our socially mobile society has a great deal to do with the acquiring of at least an average number of years of education. In all but a few sub-cultures the failure to attain a high school diploma or to remain in school at least eleven or twelve years attaches a social stigma to the dropout that can only be rendered ineffectual by financial success. The present labor market and increasing need for technical skills makes financial success well nigh impossible for the dropout and the consequent social stigmatization handicaps him in a very significant way. Dropping out of school for all but a very few is the final failure experience in a long series of failure experiences connected with school. Upon experiencing further failures in attempting to acquire economic competence, the dropout becomes a nonproductive member of society until he has reached eighteen or nineteen years of age and many times far into adulthood. These years of inevitable partial productivity and frustration take their toll of society and its resources as well as the individual dropout. Such a serious personal and social problem involving very significant numbers of our young people is of utmost present concern to educational institutions as well as the general public.

Therefore in a time when education is available to all, when adult success is so dependent upon completion of high school, why do 40 percent of our young people still decide to discontinue their education in high school? This is a heavy loss to the nation, and implies serious problems for the future of a labor force that is demanding more and more trained workers. It also represents psychological hazards for the individuals who find themselves in a marginal position occupationally. Presumably much could be learned from this group of dropouts about the successes and failures of our modern education enterprise.

Therefore this project undertakes an intensive study of all school dropouts from one age group in a small city community with a wide range of social and occupational levels. It attempts to assess the numbers who leave school, the conditions under which they leave, their developmental background, their motivations and their initial success as adults. These data have been collected over the previous eight years as part of a longitudinal study of a total age group, the potential high school graduating class of 1958.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Although an increasing percentage of adolescent youth have continued to attend high school until they were graduated, concern with the dropouts has also increased through the years.

Educators generally recognize that the needs of some types of children are not being met in the school as presently constituted, and that many if not most dropouts encounter serious adjustment problems subsequent to leaving school. It follows therefore that there are hundreds of dropout studies reported in the literature, a number of which have been carefully done. From these studies what have we learned about the characteristics of dropouts, about their reasons for leaving school, and about the adjustment problems they subsequently face?

Reasons for a child's leaving school or continuing until graduation are usually varied and complex. While lack of central heating in the child's home may well be correlated with early school leaving, few would infer a causal relationship. All studies of dropouts agree that dropouts much more often come from the lower classes. Most recently arrived ethnic groups and underprivileged minority groups provide more than their share of dropouts. Families in these groups frequently share other correlates of early school leaving such as economic insecurity, families in which older children have dropped out of school, families in which the educational attainment of the parents is low, large families, and families broken by separation and divorce. It is easy to see why children from such families leave school. The significant question becomes why do some children from families which are socially and economically underprivileged remain in school until they are graduated?

In their search to determine why some adolescents leave school while others remain researchers have examined the relationship between being poor and dropping out of school. In St. Paul only 7 percent of the reasons given by adolescents for leaving school fell under the categories: "needs money to help at home," "wants spending money," and "needs money for own support." In Louisville only 3 percent of the parents of dropouts and 4 percent of the dropouts themselves listed, "needed at home · or "financial support needed by the family" as a reason for leaving school.

Research evidence indicates that during the first year after a child leaves school a majority of dropouts do not have full time jobs. While slightly over half of the dropouts in a St. Paul study were employed, only three-eighths of those in Louisville and one-fourth of the dropouts in Tacoma, Washington, had a job at the time they were interviewed. Many dropouts say that they prefer work to school, but it is evident that a majority of dropouts leave school without having first secured a job. Thus it is clear that economic necessity in a direct sense plays a minor role in school leaving.

Lack of money may play an important role in a secondary way. Lower class adolescents are reported to be sensitive to the fact that they have less money for clothes, athletic tickets, book fees, cars and other expenses related to high school life. They want the economic symbols of adult status. As Warren Layton puts it, "No one should be greatly surprised that high school students frequently want to leave school and go to work in order to provide for themselves some of the goods and services their parents and most of the adults of today are unwilling to do without."[5]

The reasons usually reported for leaving school tend to fall in a cluster which might be labelled, dissatisfaction with school and a sense of failure to climb the academic ladder of success. When asked their reasons for leaving school adolescents frequently say; "I was failing anyway," "I just wasn't interested in school," "I didn't like school," or "I was slower at catching on than some of the kids and had trouble with school work." H. A. Dillon reports that 70 percent of the reasons for leaving school fell under this category.[3]

When researchers have examined the reasons for this dissatisfaction with school, low mental ability, poor utilization of their ability, poor motivation due to lack of parental interest or emotional problems, the promotion policies of the schools, and teachers biases against lower class youngsters have all received research attention.

On the average the dropout has the intellectual potential to successfully finish high school, but the intellectual ability of dropouts as a group is distinctly below average when measured by group intellectual tests. Surely large numbers of children with no greater intellectual potential than the average dropout finish high school. Since lower class youngsters usually get lower scores on IQ tests there is a need for studies holding constant the effects of socioeconomic status when looking at differences between dropouts and stayins.

There is general agreement that dropouts are distinctly below grade level in achievement. An Evansville, Indiana, study reported that 70 percent were retarded more than one year in reading and a Louisville study reports that 76 percent were distinctly below grade average in achievement as measured by achievement tests.[21, 13] One large study reported that seven-eighths of the children who dropped out failed at least one subject during the prior year.[13]

In general, girls seem to adjust more easily to primary and secondary education than do boys. They get higher grade point averages and test higher on group intelligence measures. Most studies report that girls are less likely to drop out of school than boys and when they do leave it is more often because they want to get married rather than because they failed, are attendance or discipline problems, or because they cannot get along with the teachers.

A number of studies have shown that dropouts were often seen as aggressive or withdrawn during their grade schools years by their teachers or their peers. While their parents have not usually been overtly hostile to the school and education, the parents of dropouts generally have not gone far in school themselves and give the school somewhat ambiguous support.

Children who have been retarded in school are much more likely to subsequently drop out. Dropouts shift more frequently from school to school and are apt to be an attendance problem, especially in high school.

Dropouts have been shown to be nonparticipants in extra curricular activities of the school, and in general they are in poor communication with the teachers and often with many of their classmates as well. They often feel that the teacher is not interested in them or their problems. The Tacoma study shows that teachers for their part feel that the dropouts lack initiative, are attendance problems, have poor study habits, are disinterested, irresponsible, lacking in skill and self-confidence, and bring too many of their home problems to school.[12]

In general, dropouts feel that the school curriculum did not meet their needs. They see little of value in their school experience and regard high school as a waste of time. Dropouts report that they have an interest in the practical. They wanted specific vocational instruction and work experience programs. Many, particularly those from minority groups, gradually lost faith in the educational ladder as a means of arriving at the kind of job they wanted and thus left school. "It doesn't make any difference whether I graduate or not. I'm still just going to be a window washer."

Failure to find satisfactions in the school and school environment is thus the principal cause of early school leaving. Failure in the academic, social, and extra curricular life in the school results in a situation so unpleasant that even though adolescents are well aware the good jobs are hard to find without a diploma, millions of them leave school annually.

Further, although a majority of dropouts have considerable difficulty finding and holding jobs, half of them do not regret having left school, and fewer than one dropout in ten has any further connection with any type of school. Dropouts usually left school because they failed to find what they regarded as meaningful and appropriate instruction, personal acceptance, and the chance to be successful. The fact that many of them were ill prepared for life is partially documented by the fact that so many fail to adjust in the work world. In Tacoma and Pierce County half of the dropouts became involved in some way with juvenile authorities.[12]

Following is a list of findings common to a number of studies with references to their origin (Numbers refer to bibliographical listings):

Dropouts were more often boys. 1,4,5,12,13,17,19.

Dropouts were more often from the lower class. 1,4,6,19.

Dropouts were more often from minority groups. 4,6,13,19.

Dropouts came more often from broken homes, but the percentage difference was not pronounced. 2,3,4,10,12,19.

Dropouts' parents had little education. 1,3,4,13,19.

Dropouts had below average intellectual potential as measured by IQ tests. 3,4,9,12,13,16,17,20,21.

Dropouts were usually retarded in reading and other skill areas. 1,11,13, 19,21.

Dropouts were usually overage for their grade as a result of being retained in one or more grades. 1,2,3,4,5,7,8,9,10,11,12,16,17,19,20.

Dropouts (particularly boys) usually failed several courses in the year prior to leaving school. 3,10,12,13,16,17,19,20,21.

Dropouts had frequently moved from school to school. 1,3,9,19,21.

Dropouts showed a marked regression in attendance in junior and senior high. 2,3,7,11,16,17,19,20,21.

Dropouts usually were not active in the extra curricular life of the school. 1,4,5,7,8,11,19,20,21.

Dropouts usually had enough money to continue in school. Although lack of money was not usually a major factor in early school leaving, indirectly it had an influence. 5,7,13.

Dropouts often had difficulty getting and keeping a job. 4,12,13,15,17.

Dropouts come from families in which parents less strongly support the schools and their children's interest in education. 8,11,18,20.

Dropouts placed little value on education as a help to themselves, and consequently had little further interest in school even though the adjustment to adult life had not been easy. 1,3,4,5,7,12,13,14.

Dropouts felt that their education should have been more practical; it should have prepared them for a vocation. 8,12,14,17.

Dropouts felt insecure and lacked a feeling of belonging in school. 3,8, 11,12,20.

Dropouts felt poorly treated by their teachers, and were fearful of asking for help. 7,8,11,12,18.

Dropouts were often dissatisfied with their social relationships in school, and they lacked friends. 7,17,18,21.

CHAPTER III

OBJECTIVES AND HYPOTHESES

This study attempts to identify all students of a single age group who leave high school before graduation, to gather all available information about their developmental years from the schools, social agencies, courts, and family, to interview each dropout student within a period of six months after he leaves school, and to assess his initial adjustment to the work-world by his work record and interviews with his employers. Comparisons will be made with the total age group of which he is a part and specifically with a control group matched on three major variables in the hope of pinpointing motivational differences. These questions will be studied: What children drop out of school? What characteristics of these children distinguish them from those that stay in school? What experiences of theirs lead to school leaving? How are dropouts seen by their peers, their teachers, and themselves? What do they think of their school experience? What do they do after leaving school, and how well do they do it?

The following hypotheses will be tested.

1. There will be a significantly greater number of boys than girls among the dropouts.

2. The dropouts will have significantly lower intellectual ability than the class average.

3. The dropouts will come from families of a significantly lower socioeconomic status than the class average.

4. The dropouts will be significantly inferior to a control group of their age peers matched on sex, intelligence, and social status with regard to:

   a. Personal and social adjustment

   b. School adjustment.

   c. Work adjustment.

d. Marital adjustment.

e. Achievement values and aspirations.

5. Those students dropping out of school at any early age will be significantly lower on ability, personality, and social status measures than those dropping out of school at later ages.

CHAPTER IV

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Definition of the Population

Studies of dropouts differ widely in how they define their population, and differences in findings can frequently be traced to these population differences. For that reason our population groups will be described somewhat in detail.

The total "age cohort" includes all students in the sixth grade of the public schools of Quincy, Illinois, in the school year 1951-52 with the addition of the following: those who joined this grade in the following three years, those of similar grade level who were in special classes for the physically handicapped, mentally retarded, and impaired sight, and the sixth graders of a Lutheran Parochial School and of a small, private boys boarding school in the community. The handicapped group was included so as to get the full range of children found in a school population. Most of these students were born in the year 1940, but some were retarded, having been born in 1939. The Catholic Parochial Schools did not choose to join in this study and their students are not included in this sample. Otherwise this cohort is a complete cross section of a middle western community of approximately 45,000 population. The community is an independent county seat in an agricultural region at least 100 miles distance from any other larger city. Children who moved into the grade after three years were not included in this cohort, but those who moved out of the community at any time were retained in the cohort.

"Dropouts" are defined as those boys and girls who ceased to attend school prior to the end of the 1957-58 school year. A few students stayed in school throughout the 1957-58 school year but did not graduate due to lack of a few credits; these are not included as dropouts. Those students transferring to other school systems were not listed as dropouts unless they stopped attending any school before June 1958.

The "stayins" include all members of the age cohort who stayed in school until June 1958. In other words the age cohort less the dropouts equals the stayins.

The "control group" was intended to be a group of equal size to the dropouts and matched with them on sex, intelligence, and socioeconomic status. It turned out that only 62 percent of the dropouts could be matched on both social class and intelligence. An additional 16 percent of the dropouts were matched with one individual for intelligence and another individual for socioeconomic status. The control group is slightly smaller than the dropout group but contains no obvious systematic bias since the matching was done by cells of intelligence plotted against social status. A detailed description of the control group is given in Chapter V.

Collecting the data

Because of other studies being made data was collected on the entire age cohort for eight years following grade 6. At the end of grade 10 a list was made of all students who had dropped out of school up to that time. A junior high counselor was selected and given training as an interviewer. He began interviewing all students who had dropped out at least six months before. During the next two years each student was interviewed approximately six months after he had left school. At the same time the current or last employer of the dropout student was interviewed about the student's work performance. During the eleventh grade a control group was selected from those still in school. The control students were interviewed the following summer as well as the employer of those who were working or had recently held jobs. Some of the controls dropped out of high school during the twelfth grade and were then shifted from the control to the dropout group. A dropout interview was held with them six months after they dropped out. This tended to reduce the control group and increase the dropout group somewhat.

Those students who had moved away from the city but still resided within a radius of 50 miles were followed up and interviewed in person. A few who had moved further away were sent a questionnaire. A few of the boys had gone into the armed services and, with the assistance of the Department of Defense, these were followed up by questionnaire also.

Some additional data were available on the entire age cohort as a result of a followup made one year after graduation. Portions of this data were included for comparison purposes at the end of this study.

Instruments Used

Much of the important data were collected through interviews with the dropouts, his parents, and his employers. The schedule of these interviews appears in Appendix A. The questionnaire that was used when interviews were impossible appears in Appendix B. Copies of all test instruments used, except those commercially available, appear in Appendix C. Following is a list of the variables studied and the instruments used to measure them.

Variables	Instrument
Intelligence --	V,S, and R Scales of the Chicago Primary Mental Abilities Test
Social Status --	Index of Status Characteristics (ISC) Developed by W. Lloyd Warner (22)
Personal and Social Adjustments--	California Psychological Inventory, administered in 9th grade. California Test of Personality, administered in 6th grade "Who Are They?" Sociometric Test "Behavior Description Chart"
School Adjustment --	California Reading Achievement Test, given in elementary grades. Years of retardation. Attendance records. High school grade point average. Average class standing in elementary school. Interview data. "Junior High Activities Inventory"

Work Adjustment --	**Employer rating.** **Length of job.** **Record of advancement.** **Work adjustment rating (from interview).** **Rating of job category (frcm interview).**
Marital adjustment --	**Marital adjustment rating (from interview agency records, court records, and case files).**
Achievement Values and Aspirations --	**Semantic Differential Test (after Osgood).** **Parental Attitudes (from interview).** **Financial status**

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

These data will be used to answer a number of general questions as well as to test the specific hypotheses stated above.

1. How Many Dropped Out?

The total age cohort of this study included 487 students. Of those who moved out of this community there were 55 for whom we were unable to obtain information and records. For the remaining 432 students accurate records of school progress were maintained and this is counted as the effective population. It is presumed that the percentage of dropouts in this "lost" group might well be greater, but certainly no less than, the percentage in the population onwwhom we do have accurate records.

Of this cohort of 432 students 152 failed to graduate. However, 14 of those who failed to graduate had aactually stayed in school till June of 1958 but were unable to graduate because of insufficient credits. They have not been classified as dropouts for the purpose of this study. There remain 138 students who are properly classified as early school leavers or dropouts. Table 1 provides a breakdown of the progress through school of the total population. Thus this study found a dropout rate of 32 percent, or 35 percent if the twelve year non-graduates are included. This figure represents a minimum rate since there might well be a greater proportion of dropouts among the "lost".

2. When Did They Drop Out?

A student may legally drop out of school upon reaching his sixteenth birthday, and this normally occurs during sophomore year. However, as is seen in Table 2, 24 percent of the dropouts (23) left school prior to age 16. The larger number of these were girls, representing actually one-third of the total girl dropouts. These cases do not represent, as might be supposed,

Table 1

Progress Through School of the Total Population

	Total		Boys		Girls	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Age Cohort	487		247		240	
Lost	55		34		21	
Effective Group	432	100	213	49.3	219	50.7
12 yr. Non-graduates	14	3.24	8	3.76	6	2.74
Dropouts	138	31.94	76	35.68	62	28.31
Graduates	280	64.81	129	60.56	151	68.95

obvious derelection of duty on the part of school and court authorities. A study of the case records of these individuals indicated that the school was virtually unable to enforce the law in these cases due to lakk of knowledge, or special circumstances such as pregnancy, marriage, severe delinquency, unruliness at school, or deception by the students and their parents.

Of the 20 girls who dropped out "illegally", 8 dropped out only 1 or 2 months before attaining the age of sixteen. In many of these cases the school authorities did not find it practicable to enforce the last few weeks of attendance when the intention of the student to drop on the sixteenth birthday was clearly understood. Six of the girls were known to be pregnant before dropping out and were allowed, if not encouraged, by the school authorities to discontinue their schooling. Three of this group were expelled from school shortly before they became 16 because of severe disagreement with individual teachers. More than two-thirds of these girls were married immediately or within 6 months after dropping out of school. This group of girls is of low social status, sexually precocious, dissatisfied with their home life, and anxious to make an early marriage and establish a home. For the most part these attempts were unsuccessful as will be seen in the later discussion of these early marriages.

Table 2

Age at Time of Dropping Out of School

Age	Boys		Girls		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 16	13	17.1	20	32.3	33	23.9
16-16½	24	31.6	17	27.4	41	29.7
16½-17	9	11.8	7	11.3	16	11.6
17-17½	14	18.4	10	16.1	24	17.4
17½ and older	16	21.1	8	12.9	24	17.4
Total	76	100	62	100	138	100

Table 3

Grade Placement at Time of Dropping Out of School

Grade	Boys		Girls		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
7	0	.0	1	1.6	1	.7
8	4	5.3	1	1.6	5	3.6
9	26	34.2	18	29.0	44	31.8
10	13	17.1	19	30.6	32	23.2
11	23	30.3	16	25.8	39	28.3
12	8	10.5	7	11.3	15	10.9
No information	2	2.6	0	.0	2	1.5
Total	76	100.0	62	99.9	138	100.0

Of the 13 boys who left school before age sixteen only one had any particular need or pressure to leave. In the one case there was no father in the home and the earnings of the boy was needed to help support the younger children. With all of the others the story was the same--dislike of school, conflict with teachers, desire for independence and adventure, and the intention to enter the service or get a job. As with the girls, they were not very successful in realizing their goals. Within the first year and a half after dropping from school none of these boys had married. Most of them lived at home and most of them held jobs at some time. Only 6 of the 13 could be said to have had a steady income. Nine of them had been arrested for different degrees of delinquency. These boys were either trouble makers or failures at school and when they had once decided to drop out it was difficult for school authorities to keep them in school.

Table 3 shows the grade placement of students at the time they dropped out of school. During grade 7, 8, and 9 it is shown that there is a higher percentage of boys dropping out of school than girls. This is in contrast to the larger percentage of girls dropping out before the age sixteen. A larger number of boys are retarded one or two years in school and therefore drop out at an early grade but not an early age. Students were dropping out of school during the grades 7 through 12, but the majority occurred in the grades 9, 10 and 11.

Comparison of early, middle and late dropouts

In order to determine the significance of various factors as they related to the age of leaving school the dropouts were divided into three groups based on the age at which they dropped out--early dropouts, middle dropouts and late dropouts. These three groups were then compared on social status, on a test of personality, and on several sub-scores on the Chicago PMA. These results are presented in Table 4. All scores were converted to T scores with

Table 4

Comparison of Early, Middle, and Late Dropouts on Ability, Personality, and Status Measures (T Score Means)

		Early -16		Middle 16-16½		Late 16½ +		Significance Tests
		N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	
Index of Status Characteristics	Boys	13	39.46	24	43.33	39	45.97	Early-Late P.=.006 Mid.-Late P.=.003 Mid. Boys-Mid. Girls P.=.02
	S.D.		7.43		6.76		7.46	
	Girls	20	42.30	16	38.13	25	45.72	
	S.D.		7.68		6.89		9.62	
California Test of Personality	Boys	8	43.25	12	39.75	29	40.59	Early-Late=not sig. Late Boys-Late Girls= Not sig.
	S.D.		48.1		31.64		26.9	
	Girls	13	36.85	9	43.44	18	44.11	
	S. D.		27.7		55.1		23.3	
V,S,R Scores	Boys	13	39.15	22	40.95	38	42.29	Early-Late) Early-Mid.)= not sig. Boys-Girls)
	S.D.							
	Girls	19	43.31	16	40.63	26	41.35	
	S.D.							
S Scores Only	Boys	9	40.33	17	49.18	33	49.73	Mid. Boys-Mid. Girls P.=.03 Late Boys-Late Girls P.=.02
	S.D.		8.19		10.37		11.74	
	Girls	16	44.44	13	41.23	23	43.43	
	S.D.		8.17		10.13		8.75	

a mean of 50 and a sigma of 10, and the means of the T scores are presented by sex and by dropout group. It is observed that there are no significant differences between early and late dropouts on the personality or ability scores, but in spite of the lack of statistical significance there are some consistent trends in these data. The early dropout boys tend to have higher personality scores and lower ability scores. For the early dropout girls the reverse is true; they have lower personality scores and higher ability scores. On the S scores (spatial) boys score significantly higher than girls. The major differences are of social status, and these differences are statistically significant. The late dropouts are consistently of higher social status with the one exception of the early dropout girls who are somewhat higher in social status than might be expected. It will be noted that these girls are also an exception on the ability measures as well. Therefore, hypothesis #5 must be rejected except for early dropout boys who are of significantly lower social status.

The earliest girls to drop out are somewhat of an exception. They seem to be quite different from the early dropout boys in that they leave school for a definite purpose or because of the pressure of circumstances. For instance, two-thirds of them were married shortly after leaving school. Several of them had extremely difficult living circumstances that required them to work. A third of them were pregnant at the time of dropping school. In contrast all of the early dropout boys but one seemed to drift out of school because of general dissatisfaction and lack of interest but with no specific goal in mind. Most of them loafed a good share of the time during their first year out of school. Early dropout boys and girls present quite different motivational patterns.

3. How Do the Dropouts Compare With the Stayins on Sex, Intelligence, and Socioeconomic Status?

To determine the general characteristics that distinguish the dropouts from the stayins they were compared on three variables. The findings reported here parallel the findings of many other studies.

Sex

Hypothesis No. 1 predicted that there would be a significantly greater number of boys in the dropout population. The distribution is given in Table 5. While a larger percentage of the boys of this age cohort did drop out of school the differences are not statistically significant. Hypothesis 1 is therefore rejected.

Table 5

Distribution by Sex of Dropouts and Stayins

	Dropouts		Stayins		Total		P-Value
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Boys	76	30.8	171	69.2	247	100	not sig.
Girls	62	25.8	178	74.2	240	100	not sig.
Total	138		349		487		

Intelligence

The test used here as a measure of intellectual ability is the Chicago Primary Mental Abilities Test administered to the entire age cohort in the ninth. Only the verbal, spatial and reasoning sections of this test were used. The raw scores on these subtests were summed and this total score then converted into T scores. For a few students on which these tests were not available, other suitable test scores (such as the Stanford Binet, Wechsler-Bellevue, and Davis-Eells Games) were converted into T scores and fitted into the distribution.

The dropouts were then compared with the total age cohort of which they are a part. The T score range for dropouts was 21 to 62 with a mean of 41.47 and a S. D. of 9.48. The difference between these means is statistically significant at the .001 level. If these T scores were stated in terms of intelligence quotients, they would roughly represent a range of 60 to 115 with a mean of 83.

In Table 6 a further comparison is made between dropouts and stayins (total age cohorts minus dropouts) by quartiles of their intellectual T scores. Seventy-five percent of the dropouts fall in the lower half of the distribution against 37 percent of the stayins. Similarly 22 percent of the dropouts fall in the upper half of the distribution against 55 percent of the stayins. There are more boy dropouts at the upper and lower extremes of the distribution than girls.

Table 6

Dropouts and Stayins by Intellectual Quartiles

Intellectual Quartiles	Dropouts						Stayins					
	Boys		Girls		Totals		Boys		Girls		Totals	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV (high)	4	5.3	2	3.2	6	4.4	37	21.6	66	37.0	103	29.5
III	16	21.0	9	14.5	25	18.1	46	26.9	43	24.2	89	25.5
II	19	25.0	26	41.9	45	32.6	44	25.7	32	18.0	76	21.8
I (low)	35	46.1	24	38.7	59	42.8	31	18.1	23	12.9	54	15.5
No Information	2	2.6	1	1.6	3	2.2	13	7.6	14	7.9	27	7.7
Total	76		62		138		171		178		349	

Thus while the dropouts cover a wide range of intellectual ability they are significantly lower than the stayins, and hypothesis 2 can be accepted.

Social Status

Socioeconomic status is measured here by the Index of Status Characteristics developed by Lloyd Warner and his associates.[22] Four ratings were made on each child, based on occupation of the father, type of house in which he lived, the residential area in which he lived, and the source of the family income. These ratings were combined into an index with a possible range of 12 to 84. The dividing lines between the various social classes were determined by studying individual cases that clustered around the breaking points. This way the following social class divisions were determined.

Group A - Upper and upper-middle class	ISC 39 and less
Group B - Lower-middle class	ISC 40 to 55
Group C - Upper-lower class	ISC 56 to 67
Group D - Lower-lower class	ISC 68 to 84

The index scores were converted into T scores with a range of 27 to 66. The mean of the dropout T scores on social status was 43.31, which is two-thirds of a standard deviation below the mean for the entire group. The range of dropout scores is from the very lowest attainable to the upper middle class. No upper class children are represented in the dropout group. This difference from the class average is statistically significant (F value .001).

In comparing dropouts with stayins by social class Table 7 shows only two dropouts, 1 boy and 1 girl, in the upper middle class. In fact there are only 16 in the upper and middle classes combined against 121 in the lower class. Even though the ISC mean is not as low as the IQ mean it will be noticed from the tables that dropping out of school is essentially a function of the lower class. Hypothesis No. 3 is therefore accepted.

Table 7

Dropouts and Stayins by Socioeconomic Status (ISC Classes)

Social Class (ISC)	Dropouts						Stayins					
	Boys		Girls		Total		Boys		Girls		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
A. Upper & Upper-middle	1	1.3	1	1.6	2	1.4	21	12.3	20	11.2	41	11.7
B. Lower-middle	8	10.5	6	9.6	14	10.1	51	29.8	58	32.6	109	31.2
C. Upper-lower	34	44.7	22	35.4	56	40.6	57	33.3	73	41.0	130	37.2
D. Lower-lower	33	43.4	32	51.7	65	47.1	42	24.6	26	14.6	68	19.5
No information			1	1.6	1	.7			1	.6	1	.3
Total	76		62		138		171		178		349	

4. Purpose and Selection of A Control Group

The above findings are not new or surprising. Dropouts have been found by many studies to be of lower intelligence and lower socioeconomic status. It is true that 90 percent of the dropouts come from the lower class. However, the fact is often overlooked that there are still more than 50 percent of the lower class who stay in school and graduate. Looking back to Table 7 it is noticed that there were 65 dropouts from the lower-lower class, but there were also 68 stayins. The important question therefore arises, why do some lower class children stay in school and others drop out?

Ideally the control group should have contained children matched on sex, IQ quartiles and social class. A total of only 83 boys and girls were found who could be matched on these factors. Beyond that there were some more controls added who matched dropouts on sex and either intelligence or social class but not both. Twenty-five additional students were matched on IQ for a total of 110, and 16 others were matched on ISC for a total of 101. The entire control group totaled 127. Comparisons could then be made between dropouts and the total control group, or one of the two partial control groups as the need occurred.

The matching was accomplished by plotting intelligence against social class on a four by four chart. Dropouts were then placed in their appropriate cells by their IQ and ISC scores. During the eleventh grade the stayins were plotted on a similar chart and the dropouts were matched as closely as possible cell by cell.

The remaining analyses are concerned with the data from the dropout and control group comparisons.

5. Are There Socioeconomic Differences Between Dropouts and Controls?

After the dropouts and controls were matched by the preceding method the Index of Status Characteristics scores for each group were then examined. For the dropouts the mean was 43.31 with a standard deviation of 8.18. For the ISC control group the mean was 45.67 and the standard deviation was 7.46. This difference in the ISC means between the dropouts and their ISC controls is significant at the 2 percent level of confidence. However, both dropouts and controls are significantly below the mean of the entire stayin population and there is some overlap in the probable means of the dropouts and controls. It would have been possible to equate the means of the dropout and control populations by removing some of the higher status controls, but it was decided that the two groups did not differ sufficiently to warrant the reduction in the numbers of controls which would have been necessary. Much of the statistical analysis was done with the three way analysis of variance technique which controls for differences in means, and it was felt that the nature of the other data analysed was not such as to make precise statistical equation necessary. The mean for the total control group was 48.29.

In spite of the fact that these two groups are approximately matched on this particular measure of socioeconomic status, the question remains whether there are other differences of a social or economic nature that exist between the two groups. For instance are there any differences in the financial resources of their families, in their living arrangements, or in jobs held by the students?

Socioeconomic Area of Residence

The area of the city in which the student resides is one of four factors included in the Index of Status Characteristics. Even though the dropouts and controls were matched on the total index, some important differences between the two groups were found on the area of residence scale taken alone. Table 8 shows a consistent trend for fewer dropouts to come from the higher social areas and more to come from the lower social areas. This means that more of the dropouts are living in the lower social class areas among their social peers, while a few more of the control families are living in somewhat better neighborhoods among neighbors of superior social status.

Elementary Schools of Origin

A similar picture is found by comparing the dropouts and controls on the elementary schools that they attended. These students came from 12 public elementary schools of the city, 6 parochial schools, and schools of other communities, both urban and rural. The public elementary schools of the city have been roughly divided into 3 groups according to socioeconomic classification. Group 3 includes the lowest class schools and these are largely patronized by families with no steady employment or who are employed at unskilled manual labor. Group 2 schools range from the upper-lower socioeconomic classification to the lower-middle class. Group 1 schools are middle class populations with some upper-middle and upper class patrons and a very few lower class families scattered in the area of two of these schools. Table 9 shows that the dropouts tend to come from the schools of the poorer neighborhoods.

Table 8

Socioeconomic Area of Residence of Dropouts and Their Controls

City Area	Dropouts				Controls			
	Boys	Girls	Total		Boys	Girls	Total	
			N	%			N	%
1 (high)	2	0	2	1.4	3	0	3	3.0
2	1	1	2	1.4	2	1	3	3.0
3	3	2	5	3.6	4	2	6	5.9
4	10	6	16	11.6	9	15	24	23.8
5	15	19	34	24.6	21	12	33	32.7
6	12	8	20	14.5	2	6	8	7.9
7	25	23	48	34.8	12	8	20	19.8
Rural	6	2	8	5.8	2	2	4	3.9
No information	2	1	3	2.2	0	0	0	.0
Total	76	62	138		55	46	101	

Table 9

Percentages of Dropouts and Controls and Elementary School of Origin -- by Status Level of the School

	No of Schools	Dropouts	ISC Controls	All Controls
Schools of Origin				
Group 1. Highest status	3	7.3%	11.9%	19.6%
Group 2. Middle status	4	26.8%	30.7%	26.8%
Group 3. Lowest status	5	43.5%	30.7%	25.2%
Other school systems	-	22.4%	26.7%	28.4%

Financial Factors

A few matters of personal financial nature were further explored. As might be expected the control group was living with parents or relatives except for three students who were renting while going to school. The dropout girls who had married were renting their homes usually and two were buying their homes. However, 77 percent of the dropouts were still living with their parents, and this was rather contrary to expectations. Only three boys who had married had moved out into their own homes.

When the dropouts were interviewed six months or more after they had dropped out of school they were asked what was the major reason for their leaving school. Only seven dropouts (5 percent) gave clear evidence of having to leave school for financial reasons. The majority of them (75 percent) stated quite clearly there was no financial necessity for leaving school. The remaining 20 percent were either unsure, or this information was lacking in their record. Comparable information is of course not available on the control group.

It was possible to judge both controls and dropouts as to whether they were self supporting or not. On the basis of questions in the interviews concerning their jobs, income, payment of board and room, clothing purchases, etc., judgements were made on the degree of their dependency with the following results:

	Dropouts N=119	Controls N=112
Self supporting	55%	70%
Partially self supporting	18%	12%
Dependent on parents	27%	18%

Thus even though the dropouts have been out of school for six months there were still more control students who were self supporting than dropouts, and more dropouts who were still dependent on their parents.

Further evidence is gained on financial status by looking back at the part time jobs held by students in both groups during their years in high school. Here again the dropouts show less concern with work and monetary rewards than the control group.

	Dropouts N=138	Controls N=127
Part time jobs	40%	80%
Did not work	50%	16%
No information	10%	4%

Even though the total of the control group is smaller than the dropout group they had twice as many working in part time jobs during the school year.

While relatively few of either of these groups owned a car it was still interesting to note that more than twice as many dropouts owned cars as controls.

	Dropouts N=138	Controls N=127
Owned car	26%	11%
Did not own car	64%	83%
Owned motorcycle	0%	1%
No information	10%	5%

In relatively few cases was ownership of a car necessary to holding a

In relatively few cases was ownership of a car necessary to holding a

job but still a number of dropouts owned cars.

It would seem therefore that financial need is not a major pressure forcing these dropouts out of school. As compared with their controls they have shown less concern about earning a living both during their school years and the first six months after they have left school. Nevertheless, they are still more ready to spend money to own and operate a car.

Family Size and Birth Order

Table 10 shows a comparison of the size of the families to which the dropouts belong as compared to the size of the families to which the control

Table 10

Size of Family for Dropouts and Controls

No. of Children in Family	Dropouts				Controls			
	Boys	Girls	Total	%	Boys	Girls	Total	%
1	6	3	9	6.5	13	4	17	13.7
2	10	7	17	12.3	21	10	31	25.0
3	18	10	28	20.3	8	13	21	16.9
4	12	13	25	18.1	12	13	25	20.2
5	10	8	18	13.0	5	5	10	8.1
6-+	20	21	41	29.7	7	13	20	16.1
No Information					2		2	
Total	76	62	138		68	58	126	

Table 11

Birth Order of Dropouts and Controls

Birth Order	Dropouts				Controls			
	Boys	Girls	Total	%	Boys	Girls	Total	%
Only child	6	3	9	6.5	13	4	17	13.7
1st child	16	15	31	22.5	25	18	43	34.7
2nd child	24	17	41	29.7	13	11	24	19.4
3rd child	14	13	27	19.7	6	12	18	14.5
4th child	7	5	12	8.7	4	8	12	9.7
5th child	9	9	18	13.0	5	5	10	8.1
No Informatio					2		2	
Total	76	62	138		68	58	126	

population belongs. Table 11 shows a comparison of birth order of dropouts to that of the controls. Dropouts more frequently come from the larger families of five or six or more children, and less frequently are only or first-born children. This is consistent with the earlier data suggesting that the dropouts come from the socioeconomic area of residence where families are usually larger.

6. The Personality Adjustment of Dropouts and Their Controls

The California Test of Personality is a self-report inventory designed to measure social and personal adjustment. This instrument was administered to this age group when they were in the sixth grade, in the spring of 1952. Ninety of the dropouts and 94 of the controls took this test. Table 12 shows the scores of the dropouts as compared with the controls on this measure. This test was administered at least three years before any sizable number of these children began to drop out of school.

As can be seen in Table 12 the controls had scores in the most favorable quartile more than three times as often as the dropouts. The controls were also somewhat less likely to have scores in the most unfavorable or maladjusted quartile. The results were similar for both sexes.

quartile. The results were similar for both sexes.

The California Test of Personality contains two subscales, Self Adjustment and Social Adjustment, as well as a Total Adjustment score. The dropouts received lower scores on the California Test of Personality than did the controls significant at the two percent level of confidence on the subsection of the test relating to self adjustment. On the rating of their social adjustment the dropouts' scores were significantly lower at the one-half of one percent level of confidence. Total adjustment scores were significantly lower for the dropout group at the ten percent level of confidence. However, these results were not found to be specifically attributable to the difference between dropouts and controls when the three way analysis of variance was used to analyze them (see Section 13, Chapter V).

Table 12

California Test of Personality Scores of Dropouts and Controls by Sex (Percentages)

Quartiles	Dropouts			Controls		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
Q4 (High)	6	7½	7	27	20	23
Q3	30	25	28	18	24	21
Q2	28	30	29	29	24	27
Q1	36	37½	37	27	31	29
Total N	50	40	90	49	45	94

Table 13

California Psychological Inventory Scores of Dropouts and Controls by Sex (Percentages)

Quartiles	Dropouts			Controls		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
Q4 (High)	15	7	11	28	15	21
Q3	19	10	14	17	13	15
Q2	12	38	26	28	32	30
Q1	54	45	49	28	41	34
Total N	26	29	55	58	54	112

The California Psychological Inventory

When this age group reached the tenth grade another self-report instrument was administered to all those still in school, the California Psychological Inventory. Since this test was intended primarily for use with normal adults and adolescents, it endeavors to measure behavior which is related to the favorable and positive aspects of personality rather than the morbid and pathological. The test measures such qualities as sociability, socialization, responsibility, intellectual efficiency, dominance, self-acceptance, tolerance, self-control, etc. Since the test was not given until the spring of the year when most of the group was in the tenth grade, many of the early school leavers had already dropped out. Consequently 112 of the controls but only 55 of the dropouts took the test. Table 13 reports on the differences between these groups on this test.

Since for the age group as a whole there is a positive correlation of .33 between ISC and scores on this test and a correlation of .43 between intelligence and this test, the control group as well as the dropouts have below average scores. Nevertheless, the control group had twice as many scores in the most favorable quartile and only two-thirds as many scores in the least favorable quartile. Half of the dropouts had scores in the bottom quartile on this test. Since it seems likely that those leaving school before the tenth grade would have been even less well adjusted than those leaving school late in high school, differences in personality adjustment between dropouts and controls would seem to be quite significant.

When we gave the California Psychological Inventory to about 20 dropouts a year after they left school, we found that those who had found jobs or had married had higher scores on this test, than they had had when they were in school, while those who were drifting from one odd job to another and those who had not found work had even poorer scores than they had prior to leaving school.

Sentence Completion Test

One further measure of personality adjustment was given to the dropouts and controls near the close of the year when most of these children were in the tenth grade. Liddle developed a sentence completion test to measure maturity of approach of adolescents to certain developmental tasks of adolescence, namely, achieving autonomy, learning one's psycho-socio-biological sex role, accepting oneself as a worthwhile person, and acceptance of and respect for others.

The 105 control group children who took this test had more favorable scores on each of the four developmental tasks than did the 45 children who subsequently dropped out of school, but on three of the tasks the differences were not statistically significant. Each child was rated on a five point scale for each of the four tasks. These results are reported in Table 14.

The personalities of the dropouts were particularly marked by a lack of acceptance of and respect for others. Only two of the dropouts compared with 21 of their controls had the most favorable rating on this task while ten dropouts and seven controls had the least favorable rating. It would seem that the potential dropouts had uncooperative and negative attitudes toward others and that their disagreements were person-centered rather than problem-centered. These attitudes, expressed on the sentence completion test apparently found expression also in their behavior, and probably contributed to the school-leaving syndrome.

On the other hand, on some of the other tasks, such as the autonomy task, the potential dropouts as a group were doing relatively well. They seemed as eager as other adolescents for increased independence; they were not unduly fearful of unstructured situations; and they did not blindly adhere to the ideas of others. It seems probable that the feeling that they were ready for increased independence, when combined with hostile feelings directed toward others, contributed to their decision to leave school.

Table 14

Percentage Distributions of Sentence Completion Tests
Ratings of 45 Dropouts and 103 of Their Controls

Task	Rating					
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean
Acceptance of Others						
Dropouts	4	29	13	31	22	3.38**
Controls	20	28	30	16	7	2.62
Self-acceptance						
Dropouts	11	22	27	31	9	3.04
Controls	12	21	35	22	10	2.95
Sex Role						
Dropouts	4	29	33	24	9	3.04
Controls	11	30	35	19	4	2.73
Autonomy						
Dropouts	0	36	36	16	13	3.07
Controls	9	28	29	28	8	2.98

**Significant at the 1% level of confidence

In summary, on all three of these tests of personal adjustment those who subsequently dropped out of school had markedly poorer scores than the total population of their grade. When they were compared with their controls to eliminate the influences of social status and low intelligence the dropouts still had significantly lower scores on each of the adjustment measures. Their personalities seemed especially marked by a suspicious and hostile attitude toward other people, a characteristic which may well cause them to adjust poorly to marriage and to their jobs.

7. School Adjustment of Dropouts and Controls

In the process of examining why many children do not complete their education when it is provided for them, it is of course important to examine as many aspects as possible of their adjustment to the school itself. Their adjustment to the academic program is the first area to be examined.

Academic records

In both the dropout and control groups most of the children entered the first grade at six years of age with a few at five years and a few more at seven years. In the control group, no children entered school after seven years. However, in the dropout group, four entered at eight years and one at nine years. The mean age of entrance into the first grade for dropouts was 6.27 and for the controls 6.13 years. Thus, the dropouts were slightly older at their entrance to school.

The figures for school retardation, or failure to be promoted, are given in Table 15. Of the dropout group 40 students have been retarded for a total of 47 years with a rate for the entire group of 34.1 percent. None of the controls, or for that matter no other students in the grade, were retarded for two years. The retardation rate for the dropouts was over four times that of the control group and over three times greater than the stayin group. Sixty percent of the retardation occurred in the first and second grade, and this was equally true for dropouts, controls, and stayins. The dropouts, however, had more students being retarded in the upper grades. There were some dropouts retarded in each grade through the eighth, whereas there were no stayins retarded after the fifth grade. It is important to note that the control group had a lower rate of school retardation than the total stayin group of which they are a part; that is, here is a group of low intelligence and low socioeconomic status students who should be very vulnerable to school failure, and yet they have slightly less retardation than the total stayin group. This must mean that fewer of the control group have problems of adjustment to school, and the ones who do have trouble work out their adjustment to school much earlier than the dropout.

Table 15

School Retardation for Dropouts, Controls, and All Stayins

	Dropouts N=138				Controls N=127				Stayins N=294			
	Boys	Girls	Total	%	Boys	Girls	Total	%	Boys	Girls	Total	%
Retarded 1 year	26	7	33	23.9	7	3	10	7.9	19	12	31	10.5
Retarded 2 years	4	3	7	5.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total No. of Students Retarded	30	10	40	29.0	7	3	10	7.9	19	12	31	10.5
Total No. of Years of Retardation			47				10				31	
Rate of Retardation for Group				34.1				7.9				10.5

Cumulative folders of the school system were checked for all of these students to discover their academic records in the elementary grades. Teachers were asked to rank the children in their classes and divide them into thirds. The permanent file records whether the student was in the upper, middle, or lower third of his class for each particular year. The average class standing in elementary school was figured for each student with the following results:

	Dropouts N=138	Controls N=127
Upper third	4%	19%
Middle third	30%	33%
Lower third	32%	13%
No information	34%	33%

The upper third includes grades of A and B+, the middle third includes B- and C, and the lower third includes D and D- grades. The dropout clearly had the poorer academic record during their elementary years.

Reading achievement is of particular interest in relation to children who drop out of school. The standing of the dropouts relative to their controls on reading progress as shown by standardized test scores in grade school is shown by the following figures:

	First Grade			Fourth Grade			Seventh Grade		
	DO	INT	ISC	DO	INT	ISC	DO	INT	ISC
		Controls			Controls			Controls	
Percentage at or above grade level	40	50	53	56	67	73	20	36	53
Percentage below grade level	60	50	47	44	33	27	80	64	47

The dropouts have a poorer reading record overall than either of the control groups, but most interesting are the differential patterns of reading progress. All three groups improved considerably during the primary years and the potential dropouts are not severely retarded in reading at the fourth grade level. Between the fourth grade and seventh grade, however, the dropouts have made little reading progress and are in large majority retarded readers. Reading level increase is less than might be expected for all three groups at the seventh grade level. Only the ISC controls are still reading above grade level. This finding could be explained by the considerable effort spent by the school on the reading program in the primary years. All students, potential dropouts included, are then moving from being nonreaders to being readers. Both the dropouts and their controls for intelligence fall behind during the intermediate years where the reading program is somewhat less intensive. However, here again the dropouts make a poorer adjustment to this significant part of the school program than their intelligence and social status controls despite their initial progress in the early years.

The longer these students stay in school the greater discrepancy there is between the academic records of the dropouts and the controls. The average grade for the dropouts in high school is about C- as is seen in Table 16. There are very few A's. The average course grade goes down each year during the eighth, ninth, and tenth grade. By this time 60 percent of the dropouts have left school and those remaining, apparently the better students, make a slightly better record.

Table 17, however, presents a clearer picture of the academic accomplishments of dropouts as compared to the total control group. A grade point average was obtained for each student by averaging all the grades he had obtained in grades nine through twelve inclusive. The grade of A was weighte at 5 points, B at 4 points, C at 3 points, D at 2 points, and E or F at 1 point. A percentile distribution of these grade point averages was made for the entire class and Table 14 shows the number of dropouts and controls who fell in each quartile of the distribution. The differences are quite striking. Even though the dropouts and controls are matched on intelligence and ISC, 50 percent of the controls are in the upper half of the distribution against 7 percent of the dropouts. Conversely 69 percent of the dropouts are in the bottom quartile against 7.6 percent of the controls. These two groups have been equated on the two factors that correlate most highly with school success, and yet the control group makes an outstandingly better academic record than the dropouts. There are obviously other factors of major importance influencing their school performance.

Table 16

Grades of Dropouts During High School

Course Grades	Grade Level						
	8	9	10	11	12	Total	%
A	13	4	4	4	-	25	1.5
B	130	65	30	13	-	238	14.1
C	298	165	80	51	3	597	35.3
D	235	172	114	44	1	566	33.5
E) F)	64	107	72	21	-	264	15.6
Total	740	513	300	133	4	1690	
Grade Point Averages	2.72	2.39	2.27	2.51	2.75	2.52	

Note: A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, E or F=1.

Table 17

High School Grade Point Averages of Controls and Dropouts (by Quartiles)

Quartiles of Grade Pt. Averages	Dropouts				Controls			
	Boys	Girls	Total	%	Boys	Girls	Total	%
IV (High)	0	0	0	0	10	12	22	18.6
III	4	4	8	6.8	26	23	49	41.5
II	8	20	28	23.9	20	18	38	32.2
I (Low)	48	33	81	69.3	5	4	9	7.6
Total	60	57	117		61	57	118	

School Adjustment in the Non Academic Areas.

Participation in extra curricular activities is perhaps the best single criterion of adjustment in the non academic area. In Table 18 it will be seen that the dropouts and controls participated in about the same activities. In the percent column it will be noticed that the most popular activity with both groups was attending athletic events followed by attendance at school dances and attendance at dances elsewhere. The pattern of participation was similar for both groups. The big difference lies in the number of people participating. In the control group every one of the 127 persons participated in the extra curricular program in some way. In the dropout group only 74 percent participated. In reading the interviews the differences stand out even more sharply. For instance, there was only one girl among the dropouts who had ever participated in homeroom or student council activities. Less than a fifth of the dropouts attended athletic events with any regularity. A great majority did not attend any athletic events or else attended once or twice and didn't go back. Only one-third attended neighborhood dances that were held in the community house in their own area.

Even when they did participate in activities they usually felt excluded or uninterested as seen in the following two quotations from interviews:

> "I never went to any of them (basketball and football games and dances). I went to one football game in the eighth grade but I did not like it. And that was enough. Mom wouldn't let me go to some of the dances and I didn't approve of them either because I never associated with those kids. Why, some of them were just little tots, little things like kindergarten."

> "Were you interested in the Girls Athletic Association or the Y Teen group?"
> "No I wasn't."
> Sister: "She went down to the Y.M. for swimming."
> "What did you think of the social life at junior high school, did you care at all for the dances?"
> "I didn't know that they had them."
> "Did you go to any of the games?"
> "No."

"Do you feel that you were generally a part of the junior high school as far as the activities were concerned?"
"No I don't. I went to one dance and stayed for ten minutes. I never went to another one."
"Do you feel like you were happy in junior high school?"
She laughed. "Just before school started and after school was out."

Table 18

Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities by Dropouts and Controls

Activities	Dropouts					Controls				
	Little	Some-times	Fre-quent	Total	% DO	Little	Some-times	Fre-quent	Total	% Cont.
Attend athletic events	18	22	25	65	47.1	13	14	69	96	75.6
Attend school dances	21	20	18	59	42.8	13	16	56	85	66.9
Attend dances elsewhere	11	8	18	37	26.8	2	12	48	62	48.8
Clubs	2	2	2	6	4.3	13	11	8	32	25.2
Member Student Council	0	1	0	1	.7	2	4	1	7	5.5
Home Room Officer	0	1	0	1	.7	8	4	3	15	11.8
Other activities	1	1	0	2	1.4	4	2	2	8	6.3
Total no. of participations	53	55	63	171		55	63	187	305	
Number of participants				102	73.9				127	100.0
Number of non-participants				36	26.1				0	.0
Total number of persons				138	100.0				127	100.0

Attendance at school is another indicator of general school adjustment. Frequent absences from school are usually indicators of some kind of problems of adjustment, either at home or at school. Table 19 shows that dropouts and controls had fairly similar absence records during the first three grades with the dropouts absent slightly more often. In the upper grades of the elementary school all three groups had a somewhat better record of school attendance. In the last two years however the absence record for the dropouts increases sharply and the records of the two control groups both decrease. All three of these groups are absent much more often than the average for the class, but there is evidence that the problems of school adjustment increase in the upper elementary grades for those destined to drop out, and in the junior high years become crucial.

Table 19

School Absences of Dropouts and Controls

Period of Years:	Dropouts		Int. Controls		ISC Controls	
	N	Average No. of Absences	N	Average No. of Absences	N	Average No. of Absences
Kindergarten thru 3rd grade	75	19.71	62	17.36	57	17.10
Kindergarten thru 7th grade	75	15.47	62	12.53	57	12.27
Last 2 years in school	74	21.89	62	8.95	57	8.53
No information	64		48		44	
Total	138		110		101	

Student Attitudes to School

The preceding evidence taken from the academic and extra curricular records of these students can be further elaborated by examining the attitudes expressed by the students themselves in their interviews. For the dropouts these interviews were taken about six months after they had dropped out of school. For the control group they were taken in the summers following their tenth and eleventh grades in school. For both groups interviews were made in the home or in the neighborhood of the student away from the school setting. In some instances parents or members of the family were near by for parts of the interview.

In their general attitude to school the majority of the dropouts openly expressed their dislike of their school experience, while most of the control group were quite happy at school, as is shown below:

	Dropouts N=138	Controls N=127
Liked school	29%	77%
Disliked school	67%	12%
Uncertain	4%	11%

They were also asked, "If you had to chose one of the schools that you liked best, would you prefer the elementary, junior, or senior high school?" In answer to this question the junior high school was singularly unpopular with both groups, and the senior high school the most popular with both groups. However there were more dropouts looking back favorably to the elementary school than controls; this might be expected with the higher level of dissatisfaction with school in general among the dropouts.

	Dropouts N=138	Controls N=127
Prefers elementary school	23%	7%
Prefers junior high	8%	0%
Prefers senior high	50%	83%
Don't know	19%	10%

The teacher, of course, is the personal point of contact between the student and the school system, and it was expected that the attitude of these students toward teachers would reflect their dissatisfaction and conflict with the school as a social system. They were therefore asked in the interview what teachers they liked best and what teachers they liked least. Each time they mentioned a name they were then drawn out on why they liked or disliked a particular teacher. The teachers mentioned scattered over the three levels but centered at junior high, presumably because this was most recent for most of them. The list of positive teacher mentions covered a wide range, in which all but two of the 41 teachers at junior high school were mentioned. Many teachers were mentioned by only one or two students of these groups, indicating that different teachers get through to different kinds of students. The list of negative teacher mentions was a much shorter list and centered heavily on a few teachers. The control group generally was getting along very well with teachers. More of the dropouts were having conflicts with teachers, but still a large percent, 70 percent, said that they were able to get along very well with all of their teachers as is shown below:

	Dropouts N=138	Controls N=127
Able to get along with teachers	70%	92%
Doubtful about getting along with teachers	11%	4%
Unable to get along with teachers	19%	4%

The dropouts were rather surprisingly objective and discriminating in their remarks in the interview. In the reasons they gave for liking a teacher the emphasis is on the teacher's attitude to students with an occasional mention of teaching method. Following are selected direct quotes from students explaining why they liked a particular teacher.

> They (teachers) never did jump on me if I did anything wrong and they didn't think I was any better or worse than the next guy . . .
>
> She was patient with me. She was strict about some things such as gum chewing but she acts the way you act. She is young, too.
>
> Well, I never got into arguments with him and could sit down and talk and he was always easy to get along with.
>
> She just didn't tell me what to do and say I had to do it. That's the only subject I got along in.
>
> Well, she was just so kind. She wasn't crabby like the rest of them.
>
> Well, if I ask X something, she would say that you should pay attention, if I ask Y something, he would explain it out.
>
> She (teacher) seemed more understanding. I could really talk to her and she would understand. Of course, I had her in homeroom and that may be why that was.
>
> Well, they would help you. X would come back and check to see how you were doing. Y never came back to look. I guess she just thought you were getting it . . . .
>
> Well, when we teased him, he teased us back. It was more fun than work . . . .

Following are the reasons given by the dropouts for disliking a teacher:

> Then something happened and I was blamed for it. It was something done in the class that I didn't do. I guess they figured because I had done some things before, I had done this, too. I got mad and walked out of there . . .
>
> Miss X always jumped on me when I didn't do anything except sit there and laugh at the boys. She asked me who I was laughing at and I wouldn't tell her. She said if I didn't tell her she would call the law on me. I gave her the number. That's when she kicked me out. I didn't care. I wanted to get caught.

> Oh, she was sort of crabby. Like when I was absent a week and I came back in the morning and forgot to go in to find out about the make-up work. She jumped down my throat about not having that make-up work. Why, I didn't have time to get that.
>
> Well, they (teachers) acted so snotty and they wouldn't talk to you. They messed around with a different class of people than you. They thought that if you had a bad reputation, they just let you go. And I was in the crowd that they didn't like. The other kids in my crowd felt the same way. That's why most of them quit out there. They can't stand the teachers.

Those students, both dropouts and controls, who said that they disliked school were then asked, "When did you begin to dislike school?" Among the controls there were so few individuals who stated that they disliked school that these figures are meaningless for that group. Among the dropouts the majority of the frustration with school began in the junior and senior high school.

	Dropouts
Always	16
In elementary school	7
In junior high	21
In high school	19
Don't know	11
	74

Dropouts were also asked, "If you had it all to do over again, would you drop out again or stay in school?

	Dropouts
Stay in school	67
Drop out of school	41
Don't know	11
	119

It was predicted that dropouts would be significantly inferior to their control group on school adjustment. In those areas that can be tested statistically the differences between the two groups have proven to be significant and the hypothesis is accepted. Additional evidence drawn from the interviews also supports this finding.

8. Comparison of Dropouts and Controls on Work Experience

The school dropouts and their controls can be further compared through their experience in the work world. In years past education was not the only, nor even the main, avenue to adult maturity; fifty years ago the majority of youth dropped out of high school, found work, and moved toward adulthood through their work experience. This was the expected procedure and many jobs or business opportunities were open to them. It is important to know whether those who drop out of school today can still find adequate avenues to adulthood.

Therefore, the dropouts and their controls were compared on their work experience. The data were gathered from the interviews with the dropouts and their controls, as well as from interviews with their employers and their ratings of the students. This information was more difficult to collect, and there are 11 dropouts and 12 controls on which we do not have information about their work experiences. Nonetheless, the data seems sufficient for our purpose here.

The Nature of Their Jobs

Both controls and dropouts reported considerable difficulty in finding jobs for young people, and the jobs available fell into a relatively narrow range. The best job obtained by any dropout was one of working in a real estate office and it lasted only one month. Three girls of the control group found clerical jobs in business offices, two control boys became apprentice mechanics, and one control boy gave private music lessons in a music store. These were all given ratings of four; no ratings of five were given.

All jobs were categorized and given ratings of one to five on the basis of the skill and responsibility involved in the work to be done; this rating scale appears in Appendix D.

The poorest jobs, those rated one, included bus boy, dishwasher, service station attendant, clean-up work, delivery boy, pinsetter, and odd manual labor jobs. The number three ratings included clerks in stores, semi-skilled jobs on production lines, receptionists, cashiers, painter, and the armed services.

In Table 20, dropouts and controls are compared on the kinds of jobs in which they were employed. Almost half of the dropouts held the lowest category jobs; over half of the controls held category two jobs. No one had category five jobs. Although those who graduated from high school were getting better jobs than the dropouts, still neither group was getting very good jobs. A follow-up of both groups was made one year later as part of another project, and those results are seen in Table 20 also. It shows some improvement in both groups, with the control group in a superior position. Furthermore, the N of 84 for the control group does not include 21 who are in college, and it may be assumed that the better jobs eventually obtained by the college group will make even greater differences between dropouts and controls.

Thus, a group of high school graduates, even when controlled for intelligence and socioeconomic status, obtain considerably better jobs on the average than their peers who drop out of high school.

The Nature of Their Work Adjustment

In addition to the nature of the job itself, the groups must be compared on the basis of work performance of each individual. A rating scale was developed (see Appendix D) that took into account the students attitude to his job, whether he had been fired or had received advances in rank or pay, the employers rating, and his statement about the job future of the student in his employ. Ratings were made by two persons independently, and in cases of disagreement ratings were given in conference.

Table 20

Job Categories of Dropouts and Their Controls (by Percentages)

Ratings	At time of interview Dropout	 Control	At time of follow-up Dropout	 Control
1 (Low)	48.4%	18.7%	24.5%	7.1%
2	36.4	57.0	42.5	19.1
3	14.4	18.7	30.8	58.3
4	.8	5.6	2.2	15.5
5 (High)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Table 21

Work Adjustment Ratings of Dropouts and Controls (by Percentages)

Ratings	At time of interview Dropout	 Control	At time of follow-up Dropout	 Control
1 (Low)	42.3%	8.2 %	21.3%	4.9%
2	16.5	22.4	25.5	17.6
3	39.4	47.0	48.9	36.3
4	1.8	0.0	4.3	30.4*
5 (High)	0.0	22.4	0.0	10.8**

*Includes nine college students

**Includes eight college students

The results of these ratings are shown in Table 21. The findings are similar to those of the job rating, but the results here are even more favorable to the control group. One-fifth of the control group was working at top capacity (rating#5) compared to none of the dropouts, while only 8 percent were at the bottom of the scale compared to 42 percent of the dropouts. In the follow-up both groups improved with the control group still superior. The college students are included in this rating on the basis of their college record. Thus, the controls not only get better jobs, but they perform better after they are on the job than do the dropouts.

Additional evidence of the superior work performance of the control group is shown in Table 22. These figures include only those who were holding jobs at the time of the assessment; they do not include the unemployed nor the college students. The controls currently working were again superior in the length of time they held a job and in their employers evaluation of them. They had received more promotions than the dropout and their employers stated they would rehire a greater percentage of the controls. At the time of the follow-up the controls again had received a greater number of promotions. The greater number of advancements received by the control workers can be partly explained by the fact that the control group, at the time of the first interview, had only been on the job three to six months since graduation from high school. It is probable that they were receiving initial job advancements and that the high rate of advancement would decrease after six months on the job.

At the time of the first interview only two dropouts received a rating of four on work adjustment. One of these boys was in the air force and was making satisfactory progress as a stock clerk. The other got a piece work job as a lining cutter in a show factory and had impressed his supervisor with his attitude and his skill; however, there is little possibility for advancement for either of these boys. In the follow-up there were four dropouts with ratings of four. Of these, one was a girl who had a steady job at a radio assembly plant after working as sales clerk in several stores previously. One was a boy with artistic inclinations who was working in a florist shop doing general handyman jobs but also doing artistic work for them as it was needed. The other two were in the armed services and making satisfactory advancements there.

Table 22

Additional Indicators of Work Adjustment
(by Percentages)

	At time of interview		At time of follow-up	
	Dropout	Control	Dropout	Control
Average length of job--in weeks	33.00	38.63	46.97	65.76
Employer would re-employ	58.2%	71.4%	79.2%	78.2%
Would not re-employ	41.8%	28.6%	20.8%	21.8%
Employee received advancements	28.9%	35.4%	43.1%	72.4%
Did not receive advancements	71.1%	64.6%	56.9%	27.6%

In the control group three students were given a top rating of five on work adjustment at the time of the follow-up, two girls and one boy. Two were employed in large manufacturing plants, and one in a dress shop. All three were highly regarded by their employers for their interest in their work, their industry and cooperative attitudes; all had been given advancements, and their employers expected to give them additional advancements. The majority of the girl graduates have gone into secretarial, bookkeeping, sales or clerical work with stores and banks. Many of the boys have gone into service, but some have gone into retail stores and have advanced to supervisory positions, particularly in the chain grocery and drug stores.

Itshould be noted that none of the dropouts have thus far found success in the types of jobs mentioned in the above paragraph about the control group. It would seem that in our culture today there is no alternative route to successful adulthood without a high school education, the lack of which puts an effective ceiling on occupational futures. A few girl dropouts do marry boys who have graduated and are moving toward adult maturity, but there are few other exceptions. Also, the qualities needed to stay in school and succeed seem to be the same qualities needed on the job as shown by the work adjustment ratings.

9. Dropout and Control Marriages

A number of dropout girls followed marriage rather than school as the pathway to adulthood. When they found themselves unsuccessful and unhappy in school, quitting school and getting married seemed like the natural thing to do. Forty-five of the 62 dropout girls married before age eighteen as did six of the 76 boys. By the summer of 1959, when most of their classmates had been graduated from high school for one year 82 percent of the dropout girls and 32 percent of the boys were married.

As can be seen in Table 23 there were 24 girls who dropped out of school before they were 16½, and 17 of them were married before the age of eighteen. Only 9 of the 32 girls who dropped out after the age of 16½ were not married by the time they reached the age of eighteen.

Many of the early dropouts began their families almost immediately after marriage. At the time of the dropout interviews 21 of the girls already had at least one child. Many of the dropouts were pregnant prior to marriage and three of the children born to dropouts were illegitimate.

Some of the early marriages give every indication of being stable and satisfying, while others got off to a bad start. At the time of the dropout interview there were already two divorces and one separation. One marriage lasted only two weeks, another two months. By the age of eighteen two girls had husbands in prison. Both of these girls had babies.

To get a general idea of the quality of these marriages a rating was made on a five point scale by two women and two men on the staff of the Quincy Project. High ratings were given to couples who appeared to be getting along fairly well and were obviously well mated on terms of cultural and religious background. Considerable attention was given to the comments of the wife or husband concerning his or her satisfactions and dissatisfactions with the marriage relationship, devotion to the husband or wife, etc.

Low ratings were given to marriages in which there was evidence of quarreling and threatened separation, application or plans for divorce, desertion, husband in jail, evidence of sexual promiscuity of either partner since marriage, or marriages in which either partner had been engaged in delinquent or criminal acts since marriage. In addition we rated down those marriages in which a relative complained about the marriage and marriages in which the girl was pregnant at the time of marriage unless the couple had been going together for some time prior to marriage.

When we look at these findings we note that those who dropped out in the seventh, eighth, or ninth grede to get married have in general made poor marriages, while those dropping out later in high school made better marriages. As is seen in Table 24 only one-fourth of the marriages of the dropouts were rated as above average as compared with 70 percent of the control marriages. One in six control marriages and three in six dropout marriages were rated distinctly below average.

Table 23

Age of School Dropout and Age of Marriage (Girls)

Age of School Dropout	Age of Marriage						
	Less than 16	16	17	18	19	Not by Jan.'59	Total
Under 16	6	3	2	0	0	0	11
16 to 16½	0	13	4	0	0	7	24
16½ and over	0	5	12	6	1	8	32

Table 24

Ratings of Marital Success of Dropouts and Their Controls

Marriage Rating	Dropouts				Controls			
	Girls	Boys	Total	%	Girls	Boys	Total	%
5 (most success)	8	2	10	13	11	4	15	42
4	8	2	10	13	6	4	10	28
3	11	5	16	21	3	2	5	14
2	9	3	12	16	1	0	1	3
1	15	12	27	36	3	2	5	14
Total married	51	24	75	100	24	12	36	100
Not married	11	52	63		34	53	87	
Percent married	82	32	54		41	18	29	
Mean rating	2.71	2.12	2.52**		3.88	3.67	3.81**	

**Difference between the mean rating of dropouts and controls is significant at the 1% level of confidence.

For better or for worse a large proportion of the dropouts marry early. More than four-fifths of the dropout girls married while still in their teens and many of them began their families almost immediately. From our study of this entire age group we know that the children who marry early tend to come from homes which themselves were broken by death, divorce or separation. Thus many dropouts are marrying out of weakness and inadequacy rather than because they are now mature young adults ready to accept the responsibilities of marriage and child rearing. In general the marriages of the dropouts have been much less successful thus far than the marriages of their controls. The fact that dropout girls tend to marry early and begin their families while still in their teens has implications for the school curriculum.

10. Reasons Given in Interviews for Dropping Out or Staying in School

The first part of the interview schedules and questionnaires with both dropouts and controls was given over to asking for specific information about their personal and school history. During the latter part of the interview, after they had expressed themselves rather fully on factors related to their dropping out, the dropouts were asked this specific question, "As you look back, what do you think was the main reason for your leaving school?" At the same point in the control interview, the student was asked, "As you look back, what do you think was the main reason for your staying in school?" A direct comparison of reasons given by dropouts and controls cannot, of course, be made since the frame of reference in which these reasons were given is so different. The dropout students undoubtedly were emotionally involved in their decision to drop out of school, and must have pondered with at least some seriousness the various reasons for dropping out or staying in. The control students, on the other hand, may have had little occasion to be confronted with the question as to why they were staying in school before the time of this interview. Their answers to the interview questions reflect a certain amount of objectivity and lack of personal involvement. Nevertheless, certain broad comparisons can be made which point to rather striking differences in their attitudes toward school, vocational success, marriage, and social adjustment.

Reasons for Dropping Out of School.

Most of the dropouts gave only one main reason when asked about their reason for leaving school. In 19 cases, however, two reasons of importance were cited. All reasons are included in the following listing of reasons in order of their frequency.

	Number	Percentage
Didn't like school	22	14
Failing in classes	16	10
Started working	16	10
Marriage (5 pregnant)	13	8
Teachers were unfair	9	6
No interest in school	9	6
Poor finances	8	5
Expected to be expelled	7	4
Too short on course credits	6	4
Failure to learn in school	6	4
Don't know	6	4
Caught in truancy	5	3
Pregnancy	5	3
Parents health	4	3
School mates unfriendly	3	2
Felt out of place	3	2
Wanted to enter service	3	2
School is run for "east-enders"	2	1
To buy a car	2	1
I am older than others	2	1
The new high school is like a prison	2	1
I kept wrong company	2	1
Discouraged by too many absences	2	1
Trouble at home	1	1
Moved out of town	1	1
Teachers were indifferent	1	1
For adventure	1	1

Too many negroes in school	1	1
I was always in trouble	1	1
Too far to go to graduate	1	1
Lack of clothes	1	1

The reasons given above have been stated usually in the words of the dropout himself. These were combined into categories of similar responses with the following results:

	Numbers	Percentage
Lack of interest	33	21
Academic failure in school	31	20
Poor social adjustment	28	18
To get a job	16	10
Marriage and/or pregnancy	14	9
Teachers unfair or indifferent	10	6
Financial need	9	6
Don't know	6	4
All othes (f. 4 or less)	10	6

These tabulations are reflected in more detail in the actual quotations from interviews with dropouts. The excerpts quoted below are in answer to one or more of these questions: What was the main reason for dropping out of school? Is it better out of school or in school? If you had it to do over, would you go on or drop out?

> You know, I was over sixteen when I quit. I had a feeling though that they were going to kick me out anyway. It was quit or get kicked out because of my bad behavior. I couldn't mind my teachers or they couldn't mind me. I don't know which... I thought I could finish the ninth grade. Then one day I was laying in bed and I just decided I was tired and I might as well sleep. I decided to quit....
>
> It seemed like there were so many kids all bundled up out there and some of the teachers didn't have time to talk with you because there were so many kids.
>
> Sometimes I wish I hadn't quit because I really liked school. I can't think just why I like being out of school. Mostly, I wish I had stayed in. I miss the people and the activities.

No. I wasn't expecting to quit when I was sixteen. I was just not getting along well out there and then they wrote that note home. I think that if I had been getting along better, I would have kept on going to school. I don't know though. I like the job a lot better. I have had this same job since I left school . . . . I don't know. It would have been alright to go on in school if things were going alright. But if things weren't going alright I suppose I would quit again. If I'd been successful in school I would have stayed on.

I have a long way to go. I do wish I could have graduated from high school. I'd give a million dollars for that.
Why?
Well, it makes you feel like you are something. People ask you what you've done. I really haven't done anything. I would be somebody anyway if I finished high school.
Then being kicked out meant a great deal to you?
Yes, it did. I just sat down in the hall and cried after that. I think I would have finished high school because the older I got, the more I wanted to go. If I had ever gotten out of Junior High, it would have been alright

It just seemed to me that all the other kids were out playing while I was in school. They said to me, "Stay in." I said, "You found out the hard way, let me find out the hard way. Let me find out for myself." It's the same way about getting married. I always say, "Let me get married and find out the hard way if it's no good. . .

I couldn't get along with teachers. That was the main reason. I really didn't like any of them . . . . In a way it seems better (being out of school) and in a way it don't. When you are in school, at least you have some place to go and pass the time.

They didn't say much until after I quit, then they tried to get me to go back. If I would have gone back, I would have flunked anyway. I was so far behind that I didn't know what the teachers were talking about . . . . I might have more interest now having been out. I know what it's like sitting out while everybody else is in. I've almost got to go back in order to get me a good job. . . . I'm kind of anxious to go back now. . .

I think I would have gone on. I was sorry right after I quit. I thought of going back about two weeks after I quit but I was scared to go back. Mom told me that if I intended to go I should go right back.
I guess you needed a little boost didn't you?
Yes, that's what I really needed, but I told Mom that if I ever failed anything, I'd quit school because you have to make it up and all that, and I knew I would have failed geography. I do miss school some when I see these kids going back to school in the mornings.

> If I had it to do over again, I am sure I would go on. Why do you say that? Well, really, I was thinking about the vacation I would have here but I find it really is not a vacation. It is a lot of work keeping a house. Here she shook her head and continued. And when the baby comes, it will be a lot more. One baby is all I want.
>
> I think I would go on to school. It is harder to work than to go to school. But I wouldn't go back.
>
> I don't know that it is better. I know I need an education, but I just couldn't get along with my teachers and there wasn't any sense in staying in school . . . . I"d stay in. And if I go in the Navy, I'm going to take school and get the rest of my education. Anybody who quits school is crazy.

Reasons for Staying in School

When the control group students were asked the question, "As you look back, what was the main reason for your staying in school?," they gave the following reasons listed here in order of their frequency:

	Number	Percentage
To get better job	40	32
Never had any other idea	17	13
Parental guidance or coercion	16	3
Simply liked school	11	9
You need all the education you can get	10	8
Necessary to enter college or other training	8	6
Wanted high school diploma	7	6
Nothing else to do	5	4
Liked the social life	5	4
Athletics	2	2
No information	2	2
All others	3	2

One way to analyse these reasons is to group them around types of attitudes as follows:

	Number	Percentage
Attitude of valuing education in itself	46	36
Education as a means to other practical ends	63	50

Parental guidance or coercion	16	13
Indifferent reasons	9	7

(Note: "Need to enter college" has been included in both of the first two categories).

Generally most controls had a fairly definite reason for staying in school, which in itself is some reason for assuming that these students were not just accidental graduates but that there were felt and understood reasons for their remaining in school. Valuing education, either as a good in itself, or as a means to other ends, represents 78 percent of the reasons. There are a relatively small number of controls who attribute their staying in school to pressure from their parents, 13 percent in category 3. Of course it will be recognized that both categories 1 and 2 may represent parental guidance or even coercion, but presumably this has been internalized by the student as his own reasons. In comparison, category 3 may well represent students who are staying in school through no wish of their own.

Contrasting these reasons with those of the dropouts there are two or three major areas of difference. The first is that of vocational aspirations. The dropouts obviously did not see education as a means to vocational success. In fact, 10 percent of them saw leaving school as a means to immediate jobs. In contrast the control students definitely saw education as necessary to their future. Similarly, in social adjustment there was indication that the poor social adjustment of dropouts was a major factor in their school leaving, while many control students obviously found satisfaction in remaining in school. Four percent of the controls indicate that social life was a major factor in their persistence in school.

Plans for the Future

The same kind of concern about vocational success is revealed through the plans for the future held by the dropouts and controls. In the figures below the control students are obviously concerned about further education and employment, whereas, the largest single concern of the dropouts is marriage.

	Dropout N=133	Control N=123
Marriage	31%	14%
Service	19	19
To finish high school	19	0
Post high school education	0	37
Employment	15	25
None	15	5

The reasons given by the students themselves are quite consistent with the data gathered from their school records and tests. The dropouts are usually leaving school without any particular plan or purpose, but rather as a result of dissatisfaction with school and with the hope that life on the outside will be better. Control students are thinking more of the future, are doing a better job in their academic and social adjustments in school, and are working toward distant goals of educational and vocational achievement. After being out of school a while, more than half of the dropouts see their action as a mistake and wish they were back in school.

11. Parental Attitudes Toward Education

In the course of their interviews both dropouts and controls were asked the question, "What did your parents think of your quitting school or staying in school?" Table 25 gives a tabulation of the answers of both groups to this question. Clearly the parents of the control group are actively interested in their child's education and have been successful in communicating this to him. Actually there are very few parents in either group who were opposed to schooling for their children, eight in the case of the dropouts and three in the controls. The predominant attitude of the parents of the dropouts is indifference or lack of active interest; 65 percent were either indifferent or did nothing in the dropout situation. This is consistent with the picture we have had earlier of the dropout student as one who drifts out of school because he finds nothing there to interest him.

Table 25

Attitudes Toward Education of the Parents of Dropouts and Controls

	Dropouts		Controls	
	N	%	N	%
Opposed child dropping out of school	16	11.6	76	59.8
Wanted child to stay, but did nothing	50	36.2	24	18.9
Wanted child to drop, but did very little	1	.7	3	2.4
Indifferent	41	29.7	8	6.3
Influenced child to drop out	7	5.1	0	.0
No information	23	16.7	16	12.6
Total	138	100.0	127	100.0

12. Personal Values as Measured by the Semantic Differential Test

The Semantic Differential test was adapted from Osgood's test for the purpose of measuring the meanings which selected concepts held for the subjects involved in this study.

The student was asked to describe the concepts self, mother, father, student, work, competition, success, love, faith, and imagination, by rating these concepts on fourteen adjective-pairs.

Each concept appeared at the top of a page and was followed by the fourteen adjective-pairs as illustrated in Appendix C and in this example.

1. ugly ___ ___ ___   ___ _x_ ___ beautiful
2. hardworking ___ ___ _x_   ___ ___ ___ lazy
3. hazy ___ ___ _x_   ___ ___ ___ clear

- ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___
- ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___
- ___ ___ ___   ___ ___ ___

14. not guilty ___ ___ ___   _x_ ___ ___ guilty

The student's description of self in the above example was scored from a plus 3 to a minus 3, according to the space checked. On scale (1) in the above example the student would receive a plus 2 for the ugly-beautiful scale, a plus 1 for the hard working-lazy scale, a minus 1 for the hazy-clear scale and a minus 1 for the not guilty-guilty scale. Note that the adjective-pairs have a positive and negative dimension and are scored accordingly.

The fourteen adjective-pairs (used for describing the concepts) were factored and three factors emerged which were descriptively named for the adjective-pairs which had high loadings on each. These factors were (1) evaluative (with adjective-pairs, worthless-valuable, good-bad, unimportant-important, and intelligent-stupid); (2) *industry* (with adjective pairs, hardworking-lazy, aggressive-withdrawn, and slow-fast); and (3) *compatibility*, (with adjective-pairs, ugly-beautiful, smooth-rough, and sad-happy).

Dropout boys and girls were compared with control boys and girls on the concepts described by these students by using only the adjective-pair scores for the identified factors. Tests of means (two-tailed test) were used for ascertaining the magnitude of the differences between groups.

Differences Between Dropout Boys and Girls and Control Boys and Girls

Although the controls scored higher than the dropouts in almost all instances, only those differences approaching the 10 percent level of significance are reported here. The data in Table 26 suggest that controls feel more positive toward *self*, *father*, and *school* than do dropouts. The difference on the concept *school* is significant at the .03 level. Controls also describe *themselves* and *school* as more active than do dropouts. Again the difference with respect to *school* is significant at a very respectable level. Dropouts, on the other hand, view the concept *competition* as somewhat more active than do the controls.

Differences Between Control and Dropout Boys.

Control boys and dropout boys differed in the way they described the concept *school*on both the evaluative and industry factors. The control boys evaluate school more positively (.009 level) and as more industrious (.006 level) than do the dropout boys. (See Table 27)

Differences Between Control and Dropout Girls

Control girls differed from dropout girls in the way they described *father* on the *evaluative* factor and in the way they described *school* on the *industry* factor. These differences are not large, but nonetheless suggest interesting differences with respect to the way these concepts are viewed. The data appear in Table 28, and show controls valuing *father* more positively and viewing *school* as more active.

Table 26

Means, Standard Deviations, Standard Errors, and P-Values for Control vs. Dropout Student Groups on Semantic-Differential Concepts

Concepts on Evaluation Factor	Controls N=42 Mean	S.D.	Dropouts N=52 Mean	S.D.	$S\bar{x}$	P-Value
Yourself	10.12	3.29	9.35	3.19	.674	0.03
Father	8.59	4.80	7.12	4.95	1.02	0.21
School	9.88	3.48	7.77	5.88	.97	0.03
Concepts on Industry Factor						
Yourself	3.71	3.29	2.79	3.80	.727	0.20
Competition	4.59	3.75	5.54	2.66	.684	0.16*
School	5.10	3.37	3.00	2.87	.731	0.01

*Dropouts view competition as somewhat more industrious or active than do controls

Sex Differences and Semantic-Differential Data.

Dropout boys and dropout girls differed in two respects. Dropout boys described school somewhat more positively than girls on the evaluative factor, whereas, girls described school as more active on the industry factor. Here it appears as though the dropout boys value school as much or more highly than dropout girls, but find no active role for themselves within the school setting. If this is true, the school may be failing to provide activities which are meaningful to this group of boys. The data are presented in Table 29.

Table 27

Means, Standard Deviations, Standard Errors, and P-Values for Control vs. Dropout Boys on the Semantic-Differential Concept School

Concept on Evaluation Factor	Control Boys N=20		Dropout Boys N=21		$S\bar{x}$	P-Value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
School	10.65	1.88	8.24	3.15	.805	.009
Concept on Industry Factor						
School	4.75	3.28	2.05	3.04	.989	.006

Table 28

Means, Standard Deviations, Standard Errors, and P-Values for Control vs. Dropout Girls on the Semantic-Differential Concepts Father and School

Concept on Evaluation Factor	Control Girls N=21		Dropout Girls N=31		$S\bar{x}$	P-Value
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.		
Father	9.10	4.04	7.06	5.16	1.28	0.11
	N=22		N=32			
Concept on Industry Factor						
School	5.41	3.50	3.62	4.06	1.035	.084

Table 29

Means, Standard Deviations, Standard Errors, and P-Values for Dropout Boys vs. Dropout Girls on the Semantic-Differential Concept School

Concept on Eval. Factor	Dropout Boys N=21		Dropout Girls N=32			
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	S$\bar{x}$	P-Value
School	8.24	3.15	7.47	7.17	1.71	not significant
Concept on Industry Factor						
School	2.05	3.04	3.62	4.06	0.978	0.11

Summary of Semantic-differential Data

The control boys and girls when compared with dropout boys and girls were found to evaluate self, father, and school more positively than dropout boys and girls. In addition they described self and school as more active or industrious than did the dropouts. Dropouts, on the other hand, described competition as more active than did the control boys and girls. Whether the latter finding indicates that competition is too active for them or whether they relish competition is uncertain, however it seems fairly sure that dropouts reject competition in the school setting.

Control boys valued school more highly and described it as more active than did dropout boys. Control girls valued father more highly than dropout girls and viewed school as more active.

These data suggest that school in particular is a more valued milieu for those students who stay in school than for those who drop out. It is also a more active place in which, it is presumed, the youngster who stays in can find a place for himself or herself.

13. Three Way Analysis of Variance of Selected Scores

A three way analysis of variance was performed with certain significant dependent variable scores to determine the degree of variance attributed to the difference between the dropout and the stayin student, high and low intelligence, high and low socioeconomic status, interactions between dropoutness and intelligence, dropoutness and socioeconomic status, intelligence and socioeconomic status, and the triple interaction between dropoutness, socioeconomic status, and intelligence. In each case the three way analysis of variance technique effectively controls for the non-compared variable or variables by equating the means of the compared populations.

Data Compared

The following instruments were used as dependent variables in this variance study:

California Test of Personality
California Psychological Inventory (CPI)
Junior High Activities Inventory (JAI)
Who Are They (WAT-1952 and 1955 administration)
Behavior Description Chart (BDC-1952 and 1955 administration)

Copies of those instruments listed above with the exception of the previously described commercial tests, the CPI and the CTP, are in Appendix C.

The California Psychological Inventory developed by Harrison G. Gough is intended primarily for use with "normal" (non-psychiatrically disturbed) subjects. Personality characteristics important to social interaction are measured by eighteen scales. The fourteen scales which were given to the dropout and control populations are as follows:

Class I. Measures of Poise, Ascendancy, and Self Assurance.

1.	Do	Dominance
2.	Cs	Capacity for Status
3.	Sy	Sociability
4.	Sa	Self-acceptance
5.	Wb	Sense of Well-being

Class II. Measures of Socialization, Maturity, and Responsibility.

6.	Re	Responsibility
7.	So	Socialization
8.	Sc	Self Control
9.	To	Tolerance
10.	Cm	Communality

Class III. Measures of Achievement Potential and Intellectual Efficiency

11.	Ac	Achievement via Conformance
12.	Ai	Achievement via Independence
13.	Ie	Intellectual Efficiency

Class IV. Measures of Intellectual and Interest Modes

14.	Fx	Flexibility

Four scales, Social Presence (Class I), Good Impression (ClassII), and Psychological Mindedness and Femininity (Class IV) were not available at the time of this test in 1956 and were consequently not used.

The three-way analysis of variance technique has been used to analyze each of the fourteen scales separately, Class I, II, and III variables, and the total score.

The California Psychological Inventory was given in 1956 to 112 control students and to 55 students who later dropped out of school. Many students who had already dropped out of school were not tested on the CPI, but the three way analysis of variance technique, by parceling out the variance attributable to the most crucial variables, intelligence and socioeconomic status, eliminates the most serious objections to the incomplete population.

The Who Are They, (see Appendix C) a sociometric instrument designed by the Quincy Youth Project staff, provides four indices of how the student is seen by his peer group. A child may be seen as aggressive, withdrawn, as a leader, and as a friend by his classmates. To some extent these scales are mutually exclusive. The Who Are They was administered to the total class population (including dropouts and stayins) in the sixth grade in 1952 and in the ninth grade in 1955. Scores were obtained for 94 dropouts and 91 control students from the 1952 administration and for 101 dropouts and 118 controls from the 1955 administration. Three way analysis of variance was performed on each of the sub scales, Aggression, Withdrawnness, Leadership, and Friendship.

The Behavior Description Chart (See Appendix C) is a forced choice student rating instrument. Teacher ratings for 95 dropouts and 94 controls in 1952 and 96 dropouts and 118 controls in 1955 are included. The population figures for both the WAT and BDC are larger for the 1955 administration because some students had moved into the population since the beginning of the Youth Project in 1951-52. Indices of Aggression, Withdrawnness, and Leadership are obtained from teacher ratings and have been analyzed.

The California Test of Personality and the Junior High Activities Inventory (see Appendix C) were analyzed by three way **analysis of variance**, but since no significant main effects were observed they will not be reported in this section.

All scores used in the three way analyses of variance have been converted to "T" scores with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10.

Procedure for Three Way Analysis of Variance of the CPI, WAT, and BDC.

All dropouts and controls with scores on the above instruments were included in the total population. Median scores on all variables were computed for the combined dropout-control group dividing dropouts into four cells as follows: 1) high intelligence--high ISC; 2) high intelligence-low ISC; 3) low intelligence-high ISC; 4) low intelligence-low ISC. The controls were divided into four similar cells. The size of the smallest cell was eight subjects for the CPI and nine subjects for the sociometric and teacher ratings. Eight or nine subjects were selected from each of the other seven cells as appropriate using a random selection technique. Thus, a 2x2x2 variance classification was created with a population of 64 and 72 for the CPI and Sociometric tests respectively. Each of the dependent variables described in the data section was then tested for the variance it contributed to the three independent variables, Dropoutness, Intelligence (VSR), Socioeconomic Status (ISC), to their simple interactions, Dropoutness x Intelligence, Dropoutness x ISC, and Intelligence x ISC, and to the triple interaction of all three. Table 30 summarizes all of the analyses which resulted in a main effect at or above the 5 percent level of confidence. "F" has been reported only for the 5 percent level and above.

Discussion of Three Way Analysis of Variance

Table 30 summarizes the analyses of variance performed on the California Personality Inventory Class I, II, III, and Total scores. The grand means for the combined dropout-control group show them to be approximately one half a standard deviation below the total class population. This deviation from the class mean is most marked in the case of the Class III scales, Measures of Intellectual Efficiency, and least marked for the Class I scales which are Measures of Poise and Ascendancy and Self-assurance.

The Class I variables are most related to a general self evaluation whereas the Class III variables are most related to the student's assessment of himself as a functioning worker in the school situation. However, considering the relatively high correlations of .33 and .43 with ISC and Intelligence of the CPI scores and the intellectual and socioeconomic inferiority of the dropouts and their matched controls, the below average means of the combined groups is not surprising. However, when a significant difference does occur as is shown by the three way analysis of variance between dropouts and controls with ISC and Intelligence eliminated as variance contributing factors, it does mean that the dropouts differ significantly from a group that is already significantly below a normal population mean.

The first of these differences attributable to Class I measures occurs with regard to the main effect of "Dropoutness" vs. "Controlness". Dropouts are significantly inferior to the controls on Measures of Poise, Ascendancy and Self-assurance. The less definitive, but still significant main effect of socioeconomic status indicates that ISC contributes to the variance between dropouts and controls. The simple interaction between "dropoutness" and ISC further bears out this joint effect. Nevertheless, the exceptionally high F in the main effect of "dropoutness" attests to the validity of Class I CPI scales to differentiate dropouts and controls with socioeconomic status and intelligence controlled.

Class II variables which are Measures of Socialization, Maturity, and Responsibility also differentiate at the one-half of one percent level of confidence between dropout and control students. Class III variables differentiate between dropout and control students at the one-tenth of one percent level of confidence. The total CPI scores also differentiates between dropouts and controls at a similar level of confidence. No significant simple interactions or main effects other than those caused by dropoutness are present for Class II, III, and total score variables. Thus, the CPI seems to indicate that dropouts are less poised, assured, ascendant, mature, and responsible than stayins if the effects of socioeconomic status and intelligence are controlled. Also the dropouts are less mature in social situations and are not able to command the degree of intellectual efficiency that the control students do.

All individual subscales showing significant main effects are summarized in Table 31. According to Gough, these indicate that the dropout

> --does not have the personal qualities or attributes which lead to status. The dropout may be apathetic, shy, restricted in outlook, and uneasy in new situations. (Cs)
>
> --may be defensive, demanding, resentful, and headstrong. The dropout may be deceitful and undependable and generally lacking in social maturity, rectitude, and integrity. (So)
>
> --is not of a conscientious, responsible, and dependable disposition and temperament. (Re)
>
> --is not able to conform to the mores of institutionalized society. The dropout is easily disorganized and pessimistic about his occupational future. (Ac)

The simple interaction present with regard to the dependent variable "Capacity for Status" (Cs) indicates that the variance due to this variable is partially obscured by differences in socioeconomic status and renders it a somewhat doubtful predictor of dropout proneness even though the negative characteristics implied by the low mean score is nevertheless true of the dropout. The dropouts low scores on this variable are almost as much associated with their low social status as they are with their "dropoutness".

The significant interaction indicated for Achievement via Independence (Ai) is interpreted to mean that socioeconomic status, intelligence, and dropoutness all contribute in interaction to the variance. The most significant main effect occurs with regard to the difference between dropouts and controls, but its significance is almost totally obscured by the interaction of the other independent variables.

The two other main effects indicating that the Communality (Cm) scale differentiates between both dropouts and controls of high and low intelligence and that Flexibility (Fx) differentiates between both dropouts and controls of high and low social status have little bearing on the personal characteristics of the dropout as distinguished from controls.

The following six scales had no significant main effects when treated separately using the three way analysis of variance technique.

Do	Dominance
Sy	Sociability
Sa	Self Acceptance
Wb	Sense of Well being
Sc	Self Control
To	Tolerance

The administration of the sociometric test the Who Are They, in 1952 in the sixth grade yielded no significant results. However, the analyses of the four scales of the 1955 administration in the ninth grade shows significant main effects. The aggressive student is identified as a dropout with chance of error only one time in one thousand as shown by Table 32. An even greater confidence level is obtained from the simple interaction of dropoutness and intelligence. Therefore this scale is very good at differentiating the low intelligence dropout from the high intelligence control. However the variance contribution of the simple interaction of dropoutness and intelligence is so great as to render the aggression scale of doubtful value in differentiating the dropout of above average intelligence.

The grand means for Table 32 hover around 50 on all subscales indicating that the combined dropout-control group is seen by their peers as an average group in contrast to the poor showing of the combined groups on the

CPI. The means further demonstrate that an average number of children of both groups received significantly higher than average scores on the Who Are They.

Dropouts are very significantly characterized by their peers as being withdrawn, lacking friends, and lacking leadership behavior. Especially high confidence levels are obtained with regard to the Friendship and Leadership scales.

The contrast between the lack of significant main effects in the 1952 administration of the Who Are They and the very definite significance of the 1955 administration suggests a very interesting hypothesis. It is that dropout prone students are not seen as greatly different by their peers in the sixth grade but that they are seen very differently by their peers in the ninth grade. It may be further hypothesized that dropout prone students are not seen as social misfits by their peers in the residential area elementary schools, but that they are so seen by their peers in the single central junior high school. It could also be said that the social manifestations of the anti-social characteristics attributed to dropouts by their peers develop between elementary school and the freshman year in junior high school. We know that many of the socioeconomic and personality characteristics concomitant to early school leaving develop early in life, that many academic frustrations develop from primary school onward, and it would seem that we now know that the manifestation of these frustrations in the peer group society does not definitely appear until the junior high school age.

Further light is shed on the social characteristics of the dropout by Tables 33 and 34 which summarize the analyses of the teacher's rating of dropouts and controls on Aggressive and Withdrawn tendencies and Leadership behaviors. Ratings of the students in the sixth grade indicate that teachers have just an inkling more indication of who the dropouts are by their social behavior than did the peer group. Teachers do not rate dropouts as leaders, but neither do they rate students of low intelligence, students of low socioeconomic status, or dropouts of low socioeconomic status or intelligence, as leaders. The 1952 BDC cannot tell us who the dropouts are, but there is some evidence that teachers are seeing dropoutness, low intelligence, and low socioeconomic status as one, at least with regard to leadership behavior. Table 34 indicates that by the time the class had reached the freshman year the teacher's ratings on behavior were much more indicative of differences between dropouts and controls. All three of the dependent variables differentiate significantly between dropouts and controls. The main effect of "dropoutness" is not obscured by the less significant main effect produced by differences in intelligence. Thus, dropouts are seen by their teachers at the ninth grade level as aggressive, somewhat withdrawn, and lacking leadership behaviors. The increase in significance of the ninth grade teacher's ratings over the sixth grade ratings indicates that teachers as well as peers do not attribute anti-social behavior characteristics to the dropout until junior high school age. If true, neither teacher ratings nor peer group choices are of great value in detecting early signs of dropout proneness. Most of the anti-social behaviors are not seen by teachers and students in the future dropout until one to three years before the student leaves school. These behavior concomitants of early school leaving are seen in the central junior high school situation, but not in the residential area elementary school . It is possible that similar results would have occurred if the ratings had been made at the beginning of junior high school by junior high school peers and teachers instead of in the last year of junior high school.

Table 30

Summary of Three Way Analyses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins; High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC (N=64) (Measures Having Main Effects at .05 Level or Better)

CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY

		MAIN EFFECT VARIABLES			INTERACTIONS				
		DROPOUTNESS	INTELLIGENCE	ISC	DO x INTELL.	DO x ISC	INTELL. x ISC	DO x INTELL. x ISC	
Dependent Variables		Controls vs. DO	High vs. Low	High vs. Low					$\bar{X}$
Class I Do, Cs, Sy, Sa, Wb	$\bar{X}$	49.22 44.84	47.28 46.78	48.59 45.47					47.03
	F	17.948		9.157		8.794			
	P	<.001		<.005		<.005			
Class II Re, So, Sc, To, Cm	$\bar{X}$	48.59 42.28	46.31 44.56	45.72 45.16					45.44
	F	9.478							
	P	<.005							
Class III Ac, Ai, Ie	$\bar{X}$	48.16 38.16	44.38 41.93	44.38 41.93					43.16
	F	12.107							
	P	<.001							
CPI Total	X	48.06 43.08	46.88 45.06	46.69 45.25					45.97
	F	5.911							
	P	<.025							

Table 31

Summary of Three Way Analyses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins;
High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC (N=64)
(Measures Having Main Effects at .05 Level or Better)

CALIFORNIA PSYCHOLOGICAL INVENTORY

Dependent Variables		MAIN EFFECT VARIABLES						INTERACTIONS				
		DROPOUTNESS		INTELLIGENCE		ISC		DO x INTELL.	DO x ISC	INTELL. x ISC	DO x INTELL. x ISC	$\bar{X}$
		Controls	vs. DO	High	vs. Low	High	vs. Low					
Cs Capacity for Status	$\bar{X}$	48.18	43.25	44.81	46.62	46.50	44.93					45.71
	F	4.130								3.5		
	P	<.05								<.10		
So Socialization	$\bar{X}$	50.28	41.46	46.09	45.65	46.87	44.87					45.87
	F	8.571										
	P	<.005										
Cm Communality	$\bar{X}$	45.40	40.62	46.25	39.78	41.62	44.40					43.01
	F			4.122								
	P			<.05								
Re Responsibility	$\bar{X}$	48.25	40.12	43.96	44.40	43.50	44.87					44.18
	F	10.708										
	P	<.001										
Ie Intellectual Efficiency	$\bar{X}$	46.78	41.40	45.37	42.81	43.56	44.56					44.09
	F	5.084										
	P	<.05										
Ac Achievement via Conformance	$\bar{X}$	47.53	33.15	42.53	38.15	42.31	38.37					40.34
	F	11.005										
	P	<.002										
Ai Achievement via Independence	$\bar{X}$	50.31	39.68	45.28	44.71	47.28	42.71					45.00
	F	7.830									12.2	
	P	<.01									<.001	
Fx Flexibility	$\bar{X}$	49.03	49.78	49.93	48.87	53.34	45.46					49.40
	F					8.460				3.5		
	P					<.005				<.10		

Table 32

Summary of Three Way Analyses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins;
High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC (N=72)
(Measures Having Main Effects at .05 Level or Better)

WHO ARE THEY (1955 Administration)

		MAIN EFFECT VARIABLES						INTERACTIONS				
		DROPOUTNESS		INTELLIGENCE		ISC						
Dependent Variables		Controls vs.	DO	High vs.	Low	High vs.	Low	DO x INTELL.	DO x ISC	INTELL. x ISC	DO x INTELL. x ISC	$\bar{X}$
Aggression	$\bar{X}$	48.13	55.69	53.14	50.69	51.80	52.02					51.91
	F	18.934						21.5				
	P	.001						.001				
Withdrawnness	$\bar{X}$	48.04	53.73	49.13	52.68	50.15	51.65					50.92
	F	6.460										
	P	.025										
Friendship	$\bar{X}$	54.21	45.88	50.06	50.06	51.60	48.49					50.06
	F	16.509										
	P	.001										
Leadership	$\bar{X}$	53.46	45.35	50.51	48.29	50.35	48.46					49.42
	F	16.522										
	P	.001										

Table 33

Summary of Three Way Analyses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins;
High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC (N=72)
(Measures Having Main Effects at .05 Level or Better)

BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION CHART (1952 Administration)

		MAIN EFFECT VARIABLES			INTERACTIONS				
Dependent Variables		DROPOUTNESS Controls vs. DO	INTELLIGENCE High vs. Low	ISC High vs. Low	DO x INTELL.	DO x ISC	INTELL. x ISC	DO x INTELL. x ISC	$\bar{\bar{X}}$
Withdrawnness	$\bar{X}$	50.82 52.99	49.18 54.62	52.21 51.60					51.92
	F		4.664						
	P		<.05						
Leadership	$\bar{X}$	51.86 45.27	51.74 45.09	46.85 49.99					48.43
	F	11.631	12.893	2.882	9.3	2.3			
		<.002	<.001	<10	<01	<25			

Table 34

Summary of Three Way Analyses of Variance, Dropouts vs. Stayins;
High vs. Low Intelligence; High vs. Low ISC (N=72)
(Measures Having Main Effects at .05 Level or Better)

BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION CHART (1955 Administration)

		MAIN EFFECT VARIABLES			INTERACTIONS				
Dependent Variables		DROPOUTNESS Controls vs. DO	INTELLIGENCE High vs. Low	ISC High vs. Low	DO x INTELL.	DO x ISC	INTELL. X ISC	DO x INTELL. x ISC	$\bar{X}$
Aggression	$\bar{X}$	48.01 55.32	52.57 50.76	51.65 51.68					51.68
	F	12.707							
	P	<.001							
Withdrawnness	$\bar{X}$	47.65 54.48	49.04 53.10	49.74 52.40					51.08
	F	7.952	2.801				2.0		
	P	<.01	<.10				<.25		
Leadership	$\bar{X}$	51.19 41.67	47.64 45.22	45.83 47.03					46.43
	F	29.898	1.923		2.9				
	P	<.001	<.25		<.10				

It is also possible that the age differential is as important as the type of school attended. However, other data such as the indications that dropouts liked elementary school far better than junior high school and the increased incidence of failure and frustration for the dropout in the junior high school indicate that the reactions of the dropout to the junior high school situation may have in some measure contributed to the anti-social characteristics observed by teachers and peers at the ninth grade level.

14. Dropout Church Affiliation

In 1958 a study of the church affiliations of all the members of the Quincy Youth Project's experimental population was made. All of the clergymen in all of the city's churches were asked to indicate all of the youth of the class of 1958 who were known to them as participants in their church, to indicate the membership status of the youth and his family, to rate the frequency of attendance and their judgment of the significance of religious belief, affiliation, and participation to the individual.

While it is not within the scope of this study to present a complete analysis of this data with relation to dropouts, Table 35 presents the simplest measure of church affiliation for dropouts and their controls for intelligence and socioeconomic status separately. Dropouts were unknown to the clergymen three times more frequently than were the controls. The simple incidence of church participation among dropouts is strikingly low. Only one third of the dropouts were even known to ministers. Of the known group less than half were church members. Religion was judged by the ministers to have been extremely important in the lives of less than 9 percent of the dropouts and to have been fairly important in the lives of 6 percent. Only 7 percent of the dropouts were regular attenders and only one was rated as a leader in his church as compared to over 50 percent members and about 10 percent leaders for both control groups.

Table 35

Church Affiliations of Dropouts and Controls
(Percentages)

	Known	Unknown
Dropouts	33%	67%
Controls (ISC)	78%	22%
Controls	77%	23%

It is difficult to interpret precisely what these results mean and causal relationships cannot be established with regard to this data, however it seems certain that the influence of churches is not being felt to any appreciable degree by those students who drop out of school. Social status is unquestionably a functional criterion of church participation, but even so, the dropouts differ widely from a group roughly equated for social status. Again, the findings from the church affiliation study lend weight to the hypothesis that the dropout differs in social acceptance of, and by institutionalized society despite the equivalence of an objective measure of socioeconomic status characteristics such as Warner's index.[22]

See Page 1

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The Problem

Despite the tremendous improvements in the quantity and quality of American education since the turn of the century, the fact still remains that approximately 40 percent of our youth do not complete their high school education. Serious handicaps in personal, social, and vocational adjustment are inevitable for these early school leavers. The present study, by utilizing longitudinal data collected over an eight year period on an age group of children in a typical midwestern urban community as a part of the larger action-research project of the Quincy Youth Development Project attempts to answer the following general questions: What children drop out of school? What characteristics of these children distinguish them from those that stay in school? What experiences of theirs lead to school leaving? How are dropouts seen by their peers, their teachers, and themselves? What do they think of their school experience? What do they do after leaving school, and how well do they do it? The following hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be a significantly greater number of boys than girls among the dropouts.
2. The dropouts will have significantly lower intellectual ability than the class average.
3. The dropouts will come from families of a significantly lower socioeconomic status than the class average.
4. The dropouts will be significantly inferior to a control group of their age peers matched on sex, intelligence and social status with regard to:
    a. Personal and social adjustment

b. School adjustment

c. Work adjustment

d. Martial adjustment

e. Achievement values and aspirations

5. Those students dropping out of school at an early age will be significantly lower on ability, personality, and social status measures than those dropping out of school at later ages.

All hypotheses were accepted except number one, which was rejected for this population, and number five, which was rejected for all groups with regard to ability, personality, and social status except for the early dropout boys who were significantly lower in social status than either late dropout boys or girls.

Dropout Statistics

There were a total of 138 dropouts from the potential 1958 graduating class for a percentage dropout rate of 31.94. Slightly greater percentages of boys dropped than girls, but the difference was not significant.

Dropouts left school at ages ranging from fourteen to eighteen. The modal number of dropouts left after reaching age sixteen and before sixteen and one-half. Twenty-four percent of the dropouts left before reaching the legal school-leaving age of sixteen, and 17.5 percent of the dropouts left school after reaching the age of seventeen and one-half. They left school as early as grade seven and as late as one month before graduation in the twelfth grade. The modal number of students left school in the ninth grade with grades nine, ten, and eleven accounting for 83 percent of the dropouts. Many of these children were overage in grade due to retardation and other reasons, and reached age sixteen in the ninth grade.

Dropouts had a mean intelligence of approximately one standard deviation below the class average. However, there were six dropouts, four boys and two girls, in the highest class quartile in intelligence and twenty-five dropouts, sixteen boys and nine girls, in the next to highest quartile. There were more boys at either end of the intelligence range.

Dropouts were very significantly lower in social status than stayin students. No upper status students dropped out of school and only one upper-middle class child left school early. There was no difference in the distribution of dropout boys and girls on social status.

A comparison was made of the difference between the early, middle, and late dropouts. Early dropouts left school before the legal school leaving age of 16 and were classified as "illegal dropouts". Special circumstances, lack of time, and deception made it virtually impossible for the school authorities to have prevented these illegal dropouts. Early dropout girls and boys presented quite different pictures. The early dropout girl left school as a result of factors and pressures at least somewhat disassociated with lack of adjustment in school. Two-thirds of the girls left with intention of marrying soon if they were not already married. Approximately one-third of them were pregnant at the time of leaving school. In contrast, the early dropout boy presented a typical pattern of repeated school failures, discipline problems, lack of personal and social adjustment of both aggressive and withdrawn types, and vocational apathy. Although there was a consistent trend indicating that early dropouts were of lower intellectual ability, social status, and personal and social adjustment, this difference was not significant except in the case of the early dropout boys who were of lower social status. Early dropout boys scored higher on Spatial (S) subsections of the ability tests than any other groups. This is an indication that these boys have not learned to utiliae, accept, and/or exhibit test behaviors calling for verbal and other traditional educational skills. However, it is suggested that they do have an ability which they can use in test situations which do not call for verbal skills, and do not arouse the emotional antipathy with which previous school failures may have endowed verbal and reasoning problems.

Although a larger percentage of boys than girls of the total class did drop out of school the difference was not significant.

The Control Group

Almost all research done on the question of dropouts has confirmed the findings of the present study with regard to the low social status and below average intelligence as a group of the dropouts. Therefore two control groups matched separately with the dropouts on social status and intelligence were formed for experimental purposes to attempt to determine why some low status, low intelligence children drop out of school and some persist until graduation.

Socioeconomic Status

After dropouts were matched with control groups separately on the basis of intelligence and socioeconomic status, additional differences were found in socioeconomic factors either factorial to, or separate from, the Index of Social Status Characteristics (Warner) used to equate the two groups. Despite equivalent ISCs dropouts were found to live in homes rated lower on a coded block by block map of socioeconomic areas of residence than control students. They also received their elementary education in greater percentage from schools with patrons of lower socioeconomic status and situated in lower class areas than did controls. Most dropouts were not forced to leave school because of absolute financial inadequacy, however it was apparent from the interviews that a considerable number felt financial handicaps. Dropouts were less able to provide their own support than controls matched for socioeconomic status characteristics. Many fewer of them were self-supporting after leaving school than controls who were still in school. While in school they held far fewer part time jobs for shorter periods of time than did controls. Despite their less adequate financial status more dropouts owned cars at the time of the interview six months after dropping out of school than did controls. Dropouts, for many of the same reasons that they are unsuccessful in the school situations are unable to obtain and hold the part time jobs which could make their school persistence more probable. If the dropouts are compared with the controls with regard to the types of jobs obtained after leaving school, it is very apparent that dropouts do not obtain as good jobs as do controls. Almost one-half of the dropouts obtain jobs of a temporary nature with no opportunity for advancement and almost no dropouts obtain jobs in the two highest rating categories. Only twenty percent of the controls obtained jobs classified in the lowest category and most obtained jobs with at least some opportunity for permanence and advancement. The work adjustment of the dropout was much below that of the control as rated by their employer. The dropout obtains a poorer job initially than the non-college control, makes a poorer work record, holds his job for a shorter period of time, and receives fewer advancements. In addition, employers state that they would rehire a greater percentage of the controls than dropouts based upon their work record. In a follow up of work adjustment one year after the control group had graduated, it was found that both groups had improved the kind of jobs held, their work adjustment, the average length of time a job was held, and the number of advancements earned. In all except one factor the same relative superiority of the control group was preserved. At this time employers indicated that they would rehire four-fifths of both the control and dropout employees. The data on employment and work adjustment seems to indicate that those with a high school diploma have a much greater chance of achieving vocational success much earlier despite the increased length of the working experience of the dropout employee. It further shows that the qualities that preclude job success for the dropout are very similar to those that caused him to drop out of school.

Dropouts more frequently come from larger families of generally lower social status and economic opportunity than do stayins. They are less frequently only, or first-born children. While these facts cannot be readily utilized or narrowly interpreted as causal relationships, they do provide some basis for partial prediction of early school leaving.

Personal and Social Adjustment

The combined dropout and control group were significantly below the mean for the total class on measures of personality adjustment. This variation is attributed to the below average socioeconomic status and intelligence of the combined groups and to the social status bias of the California Personality Inventory. When socioeconomic status and intelligence are controlled, dropouts score significantly lower than their controls on poise, ascendancy, self assurance, socialization, maturity, responsibility, achievement, and intellectual efficiency. In particular the dropout lacks the personality characteristics necessary to achieve status, is lacking in social maturity, is easily disorganized, and pessimistic about his occupational future. The dropout is not stable in his personal mental health, is on the defensive in social situations, and is unable to command the work habits and responsibility to succeed in the school and work situation.

At the ninth grade level dropouts are seen by their peer group and their teachers as withdrawn, not a person to choose as a friend, and lacking leadership characteristics. Teachers see some dropouts as aggressive and some dropouts as withdrawn. In contrast, neither the peer group nor the teachers were able to definitively identify dropouts by means of sociometric choices and ratings at the sixth grade level. The difference between the sixth grade for the dropout and the ninth grade is one of a change from a residential area elementary school to a single central junior high school which all children in the public schools must attend, as well as that related to the maturational changes which have occurred. This contrast between the inability of students and teachers to identify dropouts at the sixth grade level and their success at the ninth grade presents the hypothesis that the anti-social characteristics associated with dropout proneness at the ninth grade have become evident through social behavior between the sixth grade and the ninth. This emergence of new personal and social behavior patterns could be due to the change from a residential area elementary school to a large central junior high school attended by all children in the city. Of course, it also could be due to maturational changes taking place in the interim of three years. However, other evidence pertaining to the potential dropout's adjustment to the junior high school situation seems to indicate that the movement from an elementary school where the student was with peers of approximately his social status, and living in the same areas, and sharing the same value system, to the central heterogeneous junior high school is the crucial factor involved.

A followup study of the psychological adjustment of the dropouts approximately one years after they left school was made with twenty members of the population. This indicated that those who had found jobs or who had married had improved their scores on the California Psychological Inventory and those who were unemployed had deteriorated in personality adjustment. Because of the small population this data can only be considered indicative of the importance of vocational adjustment to the dropout student.

A study of the marriages of dropout and control students gives a further indication of their relative personal adjustment. A large proportion of the dropout girls marry early in life. Among those girls classified as early dropouts (below age 16) over two-thirds of them were married before they were age eighteen. This proportion almost held for the entire group of dropout girls. Many of the early dropout girls were forced into marriage by promiscuity and subsequent pregnancy. Somewhat fewer of the dropout boys marry early. At the followup study one year after the controls normal graduation date only two-fifths of the boys as compared with four-fifths of the dropout girls were married. These early marriages are not as successful as the marriages after age eighteen, and the marriages of the early dropout girls present a rather poor picture. Only one-fifth of the dropout marriages were rated above average. Control marriages were much more uniformly successful and occurred at a later age. Only one in six control marriages were below average at the time of the followup study one year after graduation.

The personal values of dropouts and controls in regard to concepts thought to be related to school persistence were assessed using the Semantic Differential technique. Dropouts view self, father, and school as less valuable (and good, important, and intelligent) than do controls. This was true for both boys and girls, however dropout boys viewed school more negatively and dropout girls viewed father more negatively. Dropouts have a rather extreme negative evaluation of these concepts for a society in which these are assumed valuable. Dropouts view self and school as less active and industrious than do controls. It seems certain that the control students have internalized society's mores regarding school and value it highly while the dropouts have rejected school.

The concept competition is seen as more active by the dropouts. This attitude is not contradictory if it is granted that competition has negative as well as positive connotations and that for the individual who has met with repeated failure in the competitive aspects of school it probably has negative connotations. This finding then suggests that the dropout is rejecting competition because it is active. In general controls place a much more positive evaluation upon the positive concepts associated with themselves and school and see themselves as more active in the school situation than do dropouts. Dropout girls evaluate their fathers negatively and probably have lacked a suitable achievement model which might have made them school persisters. The values held by the dropout student are in opposition to the mores of middle class society, and surely are both a cause and a result of their rejection of school.

School Adjustment

Examination of academic achievement and other indices of adjustment to the school situation indicate that the dropout student's difficulty with school began very early and was apparent in several ways by the time he reached the intermediate level in grade school. Dropouts entered school at a slightly older age than did controls. Dropouts were retarded four times as often as controls. Despite the fact that the controls were retarded less frequently than those stayins who were not selected as controls, the dropouts were retarded three times as often as the entire stayin population. The excellent record of the control group indicates that there is a possibility of good school adjustment for a group of low socioeconomic status and below average intelligence. Most retardation occurred in the first two grades, however, dropouts were retarded in more instances in later grades than were stayins. There is evidence that in the majority of cases school retardation has not been productive of school success. Dropouts received lower average grades in elementary school than did controls with only one-fifth as many in the upper-third of the class and two and one-half times as many in the lower-third of the class. Even so, 34 percent of the dropout students received average and above elementary grades.

Dropouts have consistently poorer reading achievement throughout elementary school than do controls. However both controls and dropouts make significant improvement in reading grade level in the three primary grades, and when they were tested at the fourth grade dropouts were not so far behind as to render school achievement improbable because of reading disability. However between the fourth and the seventh grade the dropout's rate of reading level increase fell behind that of the controls to an extent that upon entrance into junior high school in the eighth grade, dropouts were severely handicapped by lack of reading skill. It is hypothesized that the teaching of reading is closely attended to in the primary grades and that the relative interest in reading achievement is greater from the dropout and his parents than in later years. At somewhere around the fourth grade level, parental expectations of the dropout and the degree of concern with reading as a basic skill by the teacher begins to level off, and because of the cluster of disruptive forces surrounding the dropout he becomes a retarded reader. Average achievement in high school is markedly less for the dropouts than for the controls. Seventy percent of the dropouts as compared with only 8 percent of the controls fall in the bottom quartile of a distribution of average marks from the ninth grade on. The dropouts participate in fewer school extra curricular activities far less frequently than do controls. Even though three-fourths of the dropouts participated in some school activity as compared with 100 percent of the controls, many of them only attended meetings or entertainment events once or twice. This lack of participation is evidence of lack of identification with the social group which formed the nucleus of such activities, and of a system of values which made many of these activities unenjoyable for the dropouts. Despite the equation of socioeconomic status between dropouts and controls, there is some evidence from the interview data that the dropout student was not clothes as well as the control student, and that the dropout student lacked the social ease to adjust to many kinds of activities.

In the primary years the dropouts were not absent from school a great deal more than controls, however the absence rate of the dropouts increased consistently from the junior high school into high school, and that of the controls decreased. The absence rate for the dropouts becomes so excessive during the last two years of dropout school attendance as to jeopardize school achievement.

Over two-thirds of the dropouts reported that they disliked school while almost all of the controls liked school. There was a marked tendency for both dropouts and controls to dislike junior high school, although three times as many dropouts as controls liked their elementary school experience better than either junior or senior high school. The marked lack of preference for the junior high school indicates that it represented a difficult experience for both dropouts and controls. The radical change in school format from the elementary school to the junior high school could account for the total rejection of the junior high school as a preferred school by controls, and its almost total rejection by dropouts. However it also indicated that the junior high school was not meeting the needs of these children in this particularly difficult period of adolescence. This finding might be generalized in some degree to all junior high school situations, but it seems equally probable that it is at least partially indigeneous to this particular instance. Almost all of the control students got along with their teachers and no control mentioned friction with a teacher as an obstacle to school persistence. However one in five dropouts cited difficulty with particular teachers as a main reason for dropping out of school, although 70 percent of the dropouts reported they were able to get along with their teachers. Nominations of teachers liked least by dropouts centered around a few teachers as contrasted with a wide variation in the teachers liked best by both dropouts and controls. There seem to be certain teachers who, although they do not represent a serious obstacle to school progress for stayin students, do have repeated conflict with potential dropout students. Most of these instances seem based on personal rejection of the potential dropout by the teacher on the basis of social differences or academic inadequacy.

When asked the question, "If you had it to do over again, would you drop out again or stay in school?" over one-half of the dropouts wishes that they had stayed in school. About one-third indicating they would drop out again.

Self Report of Reasons For Dropping Out

The dropouts were asked, "As you look back, what do you think was your main reason for your leaving school?" and controls were asked, "What do you think was the main reason for your staying in school?" Approximately 60 percent of the dropouts indicated a strong attitude of dislike, frustration, and social dissatisfaction with school. The controls in the majority of 86.5 percent indicated a strong attitude of liking school, valuing education, and social adjustment to the school situation. Some dropouts felt that particular teachers were responsible for their decision to leave school, while no controls cited individual teachers as a main reason for staying in school. However, in their reasons given for school persistence, control students seem to accept teachers as an integral feature of the school without making reference to them. Controls saw education as a definite pathway to vocational success, and concern with vocational success loomed large in their self report of reasons why they stayed in school. Some saw education as a "good in itself", but for a large group school was the preferred means to achieving certain practical ends. In contrast, the dropouts did not see education as a means to vocational success, and some dropouts believed that dropping out of school would provide a more direct route to vocational adequacy. Some dropouts were involved at an early age in solving problems of sexual adjustment, marriage, and promiscuity, and found dropping out of school necessary because of pregnancy or impending marriage. Such factors did not enter into the controls reasons for school persistence unless we may infer that remaining in school and participating in its social life was an avenue of sexual adjustment for them. A few dropouts cited poor social adjustment as a main factor in their school leaving, and many of the dropout reasons have poor social adjustment as their background. Only a few controls cited social life as the main factor in their school persistence, however in large majority their reasons indicate good social adjustment and high evaluation of the school and education as a factor for good in their lives. In general, the reasons given by dropouts indicate that they do not see school as a pathway to practical ends, that they have not internalized an attitude of valuing education in itself, and their feelings of rejection by the school and consequent rejection of the school lend a definite negative attitude to their choice of alternate pathways to sexual and social adjustment and vocational success. In contrast the control students present a homogeneous picture of children who have internalized high parental and societal attitudes valuing education as a "good in itself" and as the only pathway to vocational success. Their attitude is almost uniformly positive and is both reason for and proof of their feeling of social adequacy in the school situation. When asked what their plans for the future are, controls reflect this same kind of attitude in their concern with post high school education and employment. The dropout students are little concerned with employment, despite their obvious need for same, and are not at all concerned with post high school education. The largest single category of plans for the future of the dropouts is marriage,accounting for one-third of all answers. On the positive side one in five are planning to finish high school, but two years after the controls have graduated,fewer than 3 percent of the dropouts have accomplished this objective.

Attitude of Parents

Both dropouts and controls were asked, "What did your parents think of your quitting or staying in school?" Clearly, the parents of control children were actively interested and would not have permitted their children to drop out under most circumstances. In contrast, the dropout parents present in large majority a pattern of indifference without any indication of positive interference in the dropout situation.

Church Affiliation of Dropouts

Dropouts were found to differ widely from their controls in the incidence and importance of church affiliations. A large majority of the dropouts were not known to community churches and so we can assume that their church contact has been minimal at the best. Very few dropouts were members of churches and only one was a church leader. The control group showed a majority church affiliation, and greater than might be expected interest and leadership in church activities. While causal relationships cannot be established, the church picture represents parallel to the school-leaving situation. Dropout students do not accept, or have not been accepted, by institutionalized society, while the control students show a marked degree of conformity to and acceptance by the schools and churches.

Descriptive. Conclusions

The dropout is a result of many disruptive forces who fails in the school situation and continues this pattern of failure at least initially into adult life and the vocational world. The dropout cannot be characterized by a neat prototype. There are as many kinds of dropouts as there are stay-ins. This study has, however, delineated certain characteristics that distinguish the dropout group from students of similar intelligence and social status who remain in school until graduation and possibly beyond. Some of these are:

1. The dropout resides in a homogeneous area of low social status.
2. The dropout does not have the skill, responsibility, and personal and social adjustment necessary to obtain and hold a part-time job while attending school and he does not obtain a good job after leaving school, does not hold a job for long, and makes a relatively poor work record.
3. In his personal adjustment, the dropout lacks the ability to

gain status, is socially immature, irresponsible, defensive, and pessimistic about his vocational future.

4. Socially, the dropout is sometimes withdrawn and sometimes aggressive. He lacks friends and is not a leader. The dropout does not participate in extra curricular activities.
5. The dropout girl marries early and is likely to be sexually precocious.
6. The dropout is academically below average, a poor reader, absent from school a lot and clashes with certain middle class teachers who reject him on the basis of social class or academic inadequacy.
7. The dropout's system of values rejects school, self, and competitive situations.
8. Though the dropout generally regrets his leaving school, he felt frustrated and socially insecure in the school situation.
9. The dropout does not see the possibility of education as a means to vocational success and can find no suitable training program in our schools as presently organized.
10. The parents of the dropout are indifferent to school persistence on the part of their children. While they may not express negative feelings concerning school persistence, they do not act to intervene on the occasion of the school leaving.

These characteristics of the dropout and his interaction with the schools have many implications for identification and prevention programs, curricular adjustment, and general administrative action by schools as well as implications for action by the entire community. The more important of these implications are described in the concluding sections.

Implications for School Counseling Programs

There are several factors that could be used by a school counseling staff to identify dropout-prone students at various levels extending from the first grade through the ninth grade. Early identification is necessary if anything is to be done to prevent early school leaving. Most prevention programs must be begun at the beginning of the seventh grade to be effective, and several types of programs need to be initiated much earlier. The dropout at or near the ninth grade, which is the modal year for school leaving, is the result of some disruptive forces which extend backward to the preschool years. Programs begun at this late date cannot hope to prevent the dropout situation. There are, of course, things that can be done at this time to accomodate the dropout situation and turn it into a partially productive experience (such as work programs, better preparation for school leaving, etc.). Table 36 lists some factors which are predictive of dropping out of school and can be obtained by teachers, counselors, and administrators without great cost. The earliest practicable date for identifying these factors, and the need for successive identifications at appropriate levels, is indicated. Much of the data needed to carry out the identification described is already contained in school cumulative records. The additional data needed can be obtained from simple objective tests, many of which could be designed after this study by school systems. Such identification could be suitably recorded and made available to teachers, counseling personnel, and administrators specifically responsible for dropout prevention programs. Much of the late data is intended for identification of those students who are probably leaving school despite prevention programs, and could be used to guide these students into terminal accomodation curricula.

Table 36

Schedule of Factor Identification for the Dropout-Prone Student

	Grade Level								
Factors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Intelligence		x		x			x		x
Social Status	x						x		
Achievement	x			x			x		x
Reading Level	x			x		x	x		x
Social Adjustment	x	x	x				x		x
		(by teacher report)					(by objective test)		
Personal Adjustment	x	x	x				x		x
		(by teacher report)					(by objective test)		
Attitudes							x		

A counseling program for potential dropouts should begin in the intermediate elementary grades and extend through school leaving. Prior to this, even, there is much that can be done by social workers, teachers, and child guidance counselors to treat seriously handicapping home conditions and academic difficulties in the primary years. However, most individual counseling cannot begin until the intermediate grades. There is a real need for early education in sexual adjustment for dropouts, especially girls. This should be a planned program designed to fit into a general sex education program for all students, providing information and counseling in the amounts needed. Such a program must begin by grade five and should have accomplished most of its objectives by the end of grade seven. Group counseling beginning at the seventh grade in junior high school can take place with students who have been placed in special groups because of the incidence of one or more of the factors which are associated with dropout-proneness. Counselors should under-take a program of guidance for social acceptance which would include the sponsorship of various activities in which the dropout-prone student can feel at ease. An important part of a counseling program at the junior high school level would be counseling and the giving of information preparatory to part-time work and the achievement of a suitable sex adjustment in adolescents. Counselors should seek the support of neighborhood activity centers in their effort to keep children in school and should become known to these groups. Finally, the school counselor should endeavor to guide every child who does decide to drop out of school at any level into terminal courses, and to help him make plans for initial adult adjustment.

Implications for Curricular Adjustments

Special educational groups who can be identified on several of the factors contained in Table 36 should be formed at several school levels, and provision for remedial teaching, group counseling, and gradual return to the regular class situation should be the goal for some, and eventual graduation under the auspices of a terminal program of approximately equal length to the academic program should be the goal for some. Particularly appropriate times for the formation of such groups are the primary school years for those who have initial difficulty mastering basic skills, the junior high school years for those with learning difficulties and social adjustment problems, and throughout high school for those for whom a terminal program is appropriate.

Central among curricular adjustments which are implied by the results of this study are the preparation of boys for vocational success at a level appropriate to their ability, and the preparation of girls for marriage and family living. Preparation for work implies the development of student attitudes that allow the school to help prepare him for the work-world and the provision of information and a suitable curriculum in which he may begin to make tentative vocational choices prior to entrance into high school. The high school program (possibly beginning in the ninth grade for some) should consist of closely supervised part-time work experience in business, industry, and, or, realistic "make work" programs. By the last year of high school the erstwhile dropout student should be learning and practicing job skills which would make him a producing member of society. All work experience programs should be supervised both through the schools and on the job. They should be supplemented by sufficient school instruction in basic communication skills and elective curricula to insure the possibility of informed citizenship. Girls would be expected to participate in the work-experience program when it seemed appropriate, however special attention needs to be given by the school to preparation for marriage and family living for those girls who may terminate education early, or who would be dropouts in the absence of special guidance and curricula. Such training would include sex education, traditional home economics subject matter, realistic education in family buying, the rearing of children, and guidance in the role of a wife and mother in the home.

Implications for Educational Administration

If any such revolution in educational objectives, methods, and subject matter is to occur as has been suggested in the above paragraphs and as is implied by the findings concerning early school leavers, it will only be with the explicit encouragement of school administrators. It would seem necessary that wider acceptance of the principle of grouping for individual differences and of the role of the counselor and guidance specialist is necessary. The findings which indicate the almost fullblown emergence of the concomitants of early school leaving in the intermediate grades very directly imply the extension of considerable guidance service to this school level, at least for this group of students.

It is possible to accomplish much without grouping with the wholehearted dedication to the task by teachers, special personnel, and the administration, however the very definitive nature of the student problem, as evidenced by the marked differentiation of dropouts from controls matched for intelligence and socioeconomic status, points to a group which would probably be more efficiently helped in a grouped situation. The need for grouping is further pointed to by the rarity of complete cooperation among school personnel for the interest of students with special problems which may be overtly expressed in anti-social behaviors. Grouping probably should not occur uniformly throughout grades one through twelve and need not encompass the school day in many instances. It could well be initiated at checkpoints indicated on Table 36 and the gradual reintegration of many students into the regular curriculum could be accomplished when their needs had been met. Crucial points for the establishment of special programs would appear to be the primary grades, grades seven, eight, and nine, in junior high school, and throughout high school for certain students.

The findings of this study imply that the large central junior high school is not meeting the needs of dropout-prone students in this period of adolescence, and is not accomplishing its own objectives in easing the transition from the neighborhood elementary school to the central high school. It is not within the scope of this paper to suggest more than logical alternatives to the large central junior high school and those are based exclusively on the needs of the potential dropout student. It is implied by the findings that the dropout-prone student would achieve better personal and social adjustment to a smaller junior high school located close to the socioeconomic area of his residence. It is implied that the dropout-prone student is not ready by junior high school age to assume the responsibility for his academic progress to the degree demanded by the fully departmentalized junior high school. It is implied that if the dropout-prone student is to attend the large central junior high school,he must be provided with curricular adjustments and special counseling if he is to become socially adjusted and successful in his school program.

Other administrative responsibilities implied by the findings outlined above are the establishment of new extra curricular programs designed to attract the dropout-prone student, the integration, insofar as possible, of the dropout-prone student into established school activities, and the encouragement of an attitude among teachers sympathetic to the plight of the low social status, academically unsuccessful dropout.

Implications for the Community

Public social, welfare, and health agencies could do much to alleviate the home conditions of the dropout by coordinating their efforts to do aggressive case work in those families which produce many children, generation after generation, who lack the parental backing, the security in the school situation, and to some extent, the means to succeed in school. The support of the business community is necessary if the schools are to carry on a successful work-experience program. Churches in the community need to establish new programs and new recruiting methods if their influence is to be in the least effective in helping the dropout student. Courts, social and welfare agencies, and the general public can all do much simply by understanding the problem of the potential dropout and participating in his education and accomodation where possible. Intelligent moral and financial support will be required from the public if the schools and other agencies are to take positive action to prevent early school leaving. However, successful prevention programs could well multiply their costs with returns to the community in the form of increased social and personal health, increased economic productivity, and reduced expenditures for welfare, crime, and education to job adequacy by employers after students have dropped out of school.

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

Page

A. Interview Schedules 109
    Dropout and Control Interview
    Employer Interview and rating sheet
    Young Adult Assessment

B. Questionnaire Schedules 113
    Out of towners questionnaire
    Armed Services questionnaire

C. Test Instruments 122
    Semantic Differential
    Who Are They?
    Behavior Description Chart
    Junior High Activity Inventory

D. Rating Instruments 132
    Work Adjustment
    Job Category
    Marriage

Appendix A. Interview Schedules

Proposed Interview Schedule

Date______________

NAME__________________________ ADDRESS________________________

* DATE DROP__________________ DAYS AFTER BIRTHDAY__________________

PRESENT JOB:____________EMPLOYER__________PAY______FROM_____TO______

PAST JOBS:______________ " __________ " ______ " _____ "______

______________ " __________ " ______ " _____ "______

Jobs during
School: ______________ " __________ " ______ " _____ "______

______________ " __________ " ______ " _____ "______

MARITAL: ENGAGED___ILLEG. CHILD___ MARRIED___ DIVORCED___SEP.___
HOW LONG___

LIVING: OWN HOME _____PARENTS______OWN CAR______________

SCHOOL ACTIVITIES: ATHLETICS_____STUDENT COUNCIL_____HOME ROOM OFFICER____

STUDENT COUNCIL COMMITTEES______CLUBS (YWCA, YMCA, GAA, Y-TEEN, ETC.)___

ATTEND SCHOOL DANCES______OR ELSEWHERE_____ATTEND ATH. EVENTS__________

PREFER ELEMENTARY____________OR HIGH SCHOOL_____________

SCHOOL SUBJECTS:

LIKED MOST_________________________

WHY_______________________________

LIKED LEAST________________________

WHY_______________________________

TEACHER: LIKED BEST______________________WHY:____________________

(Dropout continued)

NAME_____________________________

TEACHERS: LIKED LEAST__________________ WHY?__________________________

*WHEN BEGAN DISLIKING SCHOOL______________ WHY?__________________________

FRIENDS: IN SCHOOL__________________________________

SINCE OUT__________________________________

DID THEY TRY TO INFLUENCE TO QUIT?____________________________

____

HOW DID PARENTS FEEL? UP TO YOU?________________ WANTED TO GO ON?________

OTHER____

* These two items were dropped when this same schedule was used to interview members of the control group.

Employer Interview Schedule

Date ____________________

Name ______________________________

Name of job ________________________

Employer ___________________________

JOB DESCRIPTION

Abilities

1. What level of general mental ability is necessary to this job?

high ______________
average ___________
low _______________

2. What special physical abilities are required, such as heavy lifting, being on one's feet all day, nimble fingers, etc., or none?

Skills

1. What special school learning is necessary to be able to do this job? (Reading, writing, making change, keeping records, correct speech, etc., or none)

2. What other special skills are required? (Driving a car, typing, bookkeeping mechanics, painting, etc., or none)

Personal qualities

1. What personal qualities are very important to this job? (Good appearance, honesty with money, able to work without supervision, able to meet public, ability to stand routine or monotony, etc., or none)

Is this a job from which a person can work up to better jobs?

Other comments:

Employer Rating Sheet

Name of employee______________________ Date__________

Employer______________________

Instructions: Below are 14 pairs of opposite statements, columns A and B. Between each pair mark an X in the box which best describes this employee. If you cannot rate an item for lack of knowledge, leave it blank.

Column A	Like Col. A	Somewhat like A	Somewhat like B	Like Col. B	Column B
1. Very neat and attractive	✓				Sloppy and often dirty
2. Always present and on time		✓			Frequently late or absent
3. Can trust him completely					Suspect him of taking things and /or lying
4. Seems to enjoy his work					Has no interest in what he is doing
5. Plans on how to get ahead in life					Never thinks about his future
6. Cheerful and enthusiastic					Glum, sarcastic, or sad.
7. Cooperative, friendly, takes suggestions					Sassy or sullen; resents suggestions or criticism
8. Friendly to others and well liked					Others don't want him around
9. Frequently thinks up new ways to do a better job					Does what he is told and no more
10. Work always accurate and skillful					Often made mistakes and had to do work over
11. Is very fast in whatever he does					Always moves slowly
12. Very bright and quick in his thinking					Dull and slow to understand things
13. Can always count on him to stick to job until finished					Lazy, gives up easily, loafs if not supervised
14. Always has good sense of humor					Never seems to see the funny side of things

(Would you like to keep him as a permanent employee? ______________

If no longer employed, would you hire him again if you had the chance?______

Name of person making rating______________

Position______________

Interview Schedule for Young Adult Assessment*
(Follow up in 1959)

1. Name ______________________________

Address ______________________________

2. Married _____ Single _____ Divorced _____ Separated _____ Engaged _____

3. a) Living with parents ________ has own home ________

b) Number of rooms ____________ Kitchen ____________

4. Children (number) ____________

5. Employment:

	Where	Type of Job	Pay	How Long
a. Present				
Previous (since graduation)				
b. Is wife employed?				

c. How do you like your present job? ______________________________

____

____

d. Have you been promoted or received any raises in pay? ______________________________

____

____

e. Do you plan to stay in this job? ______________________________

____

____

* Also mailed as questionnaire to those out of town.

6. a. What lodges, societies, or clubs do you belong to?____________________

____

b. What recreational activities do you participate in regularly?__________

____

____

7. Have you attended school or any training courses since graduation?__________

____

8. What are your plans for the next few years? (job, family, geographic locations, etc.) ____

____

____

Appendix B. Questionnaires

Questionnaire to Dropouts Living Out-of-town

Name______________________________

Address (if living away from home, please give both your present address and home address)______________________________

____

____

Present Job (Service Rating)______________________________

Past Jobs____________Pay________From________To________

____________Pay________From________To________

____________Pay________From________To________

If you are in the service, when did you enter________________.

How do you like the service? Please explain:________________________

____

____

Do you have any plans for the future? (service career, trade, college, etc.)

____

____

Did you have a part-time job while you were in school in Quincy? If so, where?________________Pay per hr.______Hours________

From________________To________________.

Do you contribute to the support of parents, brothers, sisters? If so, please explain amount, to whom, etc.________________________

____

____

Are you married?__________Engaged__________

How long have you been married?____________Date of Marriage________

Divorced__________ Separated__________

Children (number) ____________________

Do you own a Car?______________

Letter to Out-of-towners

Dear __________:

Perhaps you will remember the Quincy Youth Development Project that has been working with young people in your age group since 1952. We are now working on a study of the reasons why some of your group left school before graduation. We hope the results of this study will help future students in the Quincy Schools.

In connection with this study, we have been interviewing several students in your school grade. Since you are not living in Quincy at present, we have prepared the enclosed questionnaire to furnish the information necessary to our study. Will you please fill out this questionnaire and return it immediately in the enclosed self-addressed envelope?

Please be as complete as you can be in answering the questions. We are particularly interested in any personal comments you may have concerning your particular feelings about school. Feel free to use the back of any sheet where the space provided is too small. All information given will be used only for research and held in strictest confidence.

Your cooperation is very important to us and will be greatly appreciated. Please fill out and return the enclosed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Consultant

Questionnaire to Dropouts in Armed Services

This questionnaire is a part of a study of the school and work experiences of the 1958 and 1960 graduating classes (including those who left school before graduation) of Quincy Senior High School, Quincy, Illinois. In connection with this study we are interviewing all of the people of these groups in their job situations. Since you have entered the service and will not be readily available in Quincy for an interview, we have prepared the following questionnaire to supply us with information which will be helpful to our study. Through the cooperation of the Department of Defense and the appropriate services, these questionnaires are being distributed through military channels. Please be as complete as you can be in answering the questions. Your cooperation is important to us and will be greatly appreciated. All information will be held in strictest confidence.

Quincy Youth Development Project

1. Your full name ______________________________

2. Date of birth ______________________________

3. Your present service address ______________________________

____

4. Your home address ______________________________

____

5. a. Date of entry into service ______________________________

   b. Place of entry into service ______________________________

   c. Duration of enlistment ______________________________

   d. Obligated reserve commitment ______________________________

6. Beginning with your entry into the service show all promotions received and the approximate date, ending with your present rating.

	Date	Rating
Entered Service		
Promotion		
Promotion		
Promotion		
Promotion		
Present rating		

7. a. What is your MOS, NEC, or AFSC number?

b. What duties do you perform in your present assignment?

c. What special skills are required to do the job to which you are now assigned? (driving a car or truck, typing, bookkeeping, mechanics, painting, etc., or none)

8. Beginning with your place of basic training list all service schools and training courses in which you have been enrolled, their duration, and indicate whether or not you completed the course satisfactorily.

Name of training course	Duration	Satisfactory Completion (Yes--No)

9. What plans do you have for the future? (service career, trade, college, etc.)

10. a. Did you finish high school?

Where?

b. Are you taking or do you plan to take courses through the USAFI to help you complete the work you lacked for graduation?

c. If neither of the above, do you plan to get a high school diploma outside the military service in the future?

11. Are you married? Engaged?

Wife's maiden name

How long have you been married?____________ Date of Marriage__________

Divorced?__________________ Separated_________ No. of children__________

12. Do you own a car?____

13. a. Have you ever been court-martialled? Describe briefly the offense you were charged with and whether or not you were acquitted or found quilty. Please give dates.

____

____

____

____

____

b. Have you ever been reduced in rating for any reason? Please explain.

____

____

____

____

When you were attending the Quincy Public Schools, did you participate in any of the following school activities: Please check:

Athletics________Attended Athletic Events_____Attended School Dances________

Attended dances elsewhere_______Clubs (YWCA, YMCA, Band, Chorus, etc.) Please name: ____

____

Student Council_________Home Room Officer___________ Others________________

____

Which of the following parts of your school years did you like best? Please check:

Grade School_____________Jr. High________________Sr. High________________

Why____

____

____

When did you begin to think about quitting school? Grade__________________

Why?____

____

As you look back, what do you think was the main reason for your leaving school?____

____

____

Was lack of money or illness a reason for your quitting school? If yes, please explain:____

____

____

If you had it to do over again, and things were the same, would you quit or go on?________________________________

Why____

____

____

How did your parents feel about your quitting?____________________

____

____

Who were your best friends while you were in school?________________

____

____

Did they try and influence you to quit?________________________

____

Which of your school subjects did you like best?__________________

Why______________________________________

____

Which of your school subjects did you like least?_________________

Why______________________________________

____

Which of your teachers in Junior High School or Senior High School did you like best?

________________________ Why?____________________
Name

____

____

Which of your teachers in Junior High or Senior High did you like least?

____________________ Why ________________________
Name

____

____

____

Appendix C. Test Instruments

Semantic differential test

Instructions

This is a test of what words mean to you. It is a new kind of test, and as far as we know, there are no right or wrong answers. We hope to find out more about what words mean to people and how people differ in the meaning they get from words by giving this test to a large number of people in your age group.

I have filled out the next sheet for you as a sample. Please refer to it as you read these instructions.

At the top of the page is a word. On the sample this is "automobile." This is not any particular automobile. Whatever "automobile" mean to you is what you are to think about.

2. Look at the first word pair:

ugly ___ ___ ___ | ___ ___ _x_ beautiful

At first glance, the idea of automobile was very beautiful to me so I checked way over to the right in the blank closest to "beautiful." There are six blanks, three on each side. Check only one for each word pair. The blanks represent your feelings like this:

	very	some	a little	a little	some	very	
ugly	ugly	ugly	ugly	beautiful	beautiful	beautiful	beautiful

Get the idea? Sometimes a word pair will not seem to have anything to do with the word at the top of the page. For instance, for "automobile" the pair:

Intelligent ___ ___ _x_ | ___ ___ ___ stupid

Didn't seem to make sense, but I just checked it on my first feeling as "a little intelligent." Will you please do this, too. It is important that you check once for every word pair.

Make each item a separate decision - - don't check them all the same. Be sure and put your check marks in the middle of the space like this:

calm ___ ___ ___ | ___ _x_ ___ disturbed

Not like this:

calm ___ ___ ___| ___x___ ___ disturbed

Look over the sample sheet on the next page and go on to the rest of the test.

001-014

ID#________________

Date________________

QYDC

Describe: YOURSELF

1.	ugly				✓			beautiful
2.	hardworking		✓					lazy
3.	hazy					✓		clear
4.	smooth		✓					rough
5.	sad					✓		happy
6.	aggressive		✓					withdrawn
7.	worthless						✓	valuable
8.	good			✓				bad
9.	slow					✓		fast
10.	calm			✓				disturbed
11.	unimportant					✓		important
12.	intelligent	✓						stupid
13.	unfair				✓			fair
14.	not guilty			✓				guilty

(additional pages were used for the following concepts; mother, father, student, work, competition, success, love faith, imagination, school)

Name ________________________________

WHO ARE THEY?

Here are some descriptions of different kinds of boys and girls. Read each description and ask yourself: "Which boys and girls in Junior High are like this?" Under each question write the names of as many boys and girls as you think fit the description. Don't write your own name under any of the questions.

1. Who are the good leaders? They are leaders in several things.

2. Who are the boys and girls who are inconsiderate of the rights and feelings of others?

3. Who are the boys and girls you run around with?

4. Who are the boys and girls who usually come and go alone and stay by themselves most of the time, even though they aren't trouble makers?

5. Who are the boys and girls who are trouble makers?

6. Who are the most popular boys and girls?

7. Who are the boys and girls that seem quiet and unhappy?

8. Who are the boys and girls who make good suggestions when an activity or project is being planned?

9. Who says unfriendly things about people behind their backs?

10. Who are the ones that are too shy to make friends easily? It is hard to get to know them.

11. In a group discussion or in planning an activity, who are the boys and girls who can take the suggestions and ideas of others and build on them?

12. Who are the boys and girls that seem to be against everything that is suggested - the gripers?

13. Who are the ones that get bothered and upset if they are called on to talk or to recite? They can't tell as much as they really know.

14. Of the people you run around with, who are the ones who come up with good ideas of interesting things to do?

15. Who are the bullies; the boys and girls who try to push others around?

16. Who are the boys and girls you would like for your best friends?

BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION CHART

Directions: In each of the sets of descriptive statements below, pick out two statements. (1) Pick out that statement which you find fits the child most aptly - the one which the child is most like. (2) Then pick out the statement which the child is least like. Place the letters of these statements on the record sheet under the number corresponding to the set of statements. Do not be concerned if the statement does not apply exactly, and do not dwell too long upon your decision. Go through the entire chart for one child at a time. Experience shows that the ratings can be completed in just a few minutes per child.

---

1. A. Others come to him for help
   B. Causes disturbances
   C. Lacks confidence in himself
   D. Doesn't go along with those who break the rules
   E. Shows emotions, but in a restrained way

2. A. Other people find it hard to get along with him
   B. Is easily confused
   C. Other people are eager to be near him or on his side
   D. Is usually willing to go along with the group

3. A. Sensitive, touchy, hurt by criticism
   B. Shows off, attention getter
   C. Is self-confident
   D. Enjoys being a part of the group without taking the lead
   E. Dislikes criticism

4. A. Is extremely quiet and passive
   B. Is a natural leader
   C. Is boastful
   D. Does his share, but does not seek leadership
   E. Finds excuses when his work is not done

5. A. Frequently gets into fights or heated arguments
   B. Exerts a good influence on the class
   C. Seems anxious and fearful
   D. Is sometimes critical of other people
   E. Is generous when in the mood

6. A. Makes sensible, practical plans
   B. Breaks rules frequently
   C. Becomes discouraged easily
   D. Usually willing to share with others
   E. Doesn't rub people the wrong way

7. A. Takes an active part in group projects and other activities
   B. Is shy and retiring
   C. Others cannot work with him
   D. Polite
   E. Occasionally contributes to a discussion

8. A. Quarrelsome
   B. Is tense or ill at ease when reciting or appearing before a group
   C. Likes jobs which give him responsibility
   D. Is quiet and seems content with himself
   E. Enjoys a conversation

9. A. His presence or absence is not noticed by other children
   B. Figures out things for himself
   C. Is impulsive and easily excited
   D. Is a good follower
   E. Is usually courteous to other people

10. A. Tries to bully and domineer over others
    B. Is quick to see valuable things in other people's suggestions
    C. Is hard to get to know
    D. Is boisterous
    E. Pleasant to talk with but seldom initiates a conversation

JUNIOR HIGH ACTIVITY RECORD

Think back on your two years of Junior High. Mark the following items True or False on the basis of your Junior High activities.

A. ART

True False

____ ____ 1. During Junior High I did a lot of drawing and painting in my free time or attended programs for art training.

____ ____ 2. In Junior High I read one or more books about how to draw or about the lives of outstanding artists.

____ ____ 3. While in Junior High I visited one or more art museums.

____ ____ 4. I enjoyed looking at painting and other works of art during Junior High.

____ ____ 5. During Junior High I had little interest or activity in art.

B. READING

____ ____ 1. During Junior High I read more than 10 books that I did not have to read.

____ ____ 2. During Junior High I read more than 5 books besides my school books.

____ ____ 3. During Junior High I read more than 1 non-required book.

____ ____ 4. In Junior High I read a lot of magazines.

____ ____ 5. I sometimes read books or magazines.

C. MUSIC

____ ____ 1. During Junior High I belonged to the school band or chorus, or other Junior High musical group.

____ ____ 2. I belonged to some non-school musical group during Junior High (church choir, band, drum and bugle corps, etc.)

____ ____ 3. I took lessons in voice or some instrument during Junior High.

____ ____ 4. Outside of school hours I attended at least two concerts, such as Quincy Symphony, Civic Music Association, High School Band or Orchestra, etc.

____ ____ 5. During Junior High I read one or more books or several magazine articles about music.

D. WRITING

True False

____ ____ 1. On my own initiative I wrote one or more articles, poems, or stories during Junior High.

____ ____ 2. During Junior High I studied the technique of writing or read one or more books about great writers.

____ ____ 3. I was interested in writing in Junior High but I did not have the time or opportunity to do much writing.

____ ____ 4. During Junior High I enjoyed the writing assignments we had in school.

____ ____ 5. I was not particularly interested in writing during Junior High.

E. DRAMA

____ ____ 1. I was in a school play during Junior High.

____ ____ 2. I was in a church, community, or other type of out-of-school drama activity during Junior High.

____ ____ 3. I was interested in drama but I did not have the time or/and opportunity to participate.

____ ____ 4. I enjoyed watching plays during Junior High.

____ ____ 5. I was not particularly interested in dramatic events during Junior High.

F. SCIENCE

____ ____ 1. During Junior High I did a considerable amount of "extra" work in science, such as doing scientific experiments in my home, attending science club meetings, etc.

____ ____ 2. During Junior High I did quite a lot of reading about scientific subjects.

____ ____ 3. I took science as an elective course during Junior High.

____ ____ 4. During Junior High I enjoyed science courses.

____ ____ 5. I had little interest in science during Junior High.

G. SPORTS

____ ____ 1. I played on one or more varsity school teams during Junior High.

____ ____ 2. I participated in athletic games a lot during Junior High other than varsity contests in addition to those in gym classes.

____ ____ 3. During Junior High I spent considerable time practicing one or more sports in order to improve.

True False

____ ____ 4. I attended six or more high school and/or Junior High athletic events during Junior High.

____ ____ 5. I was not particularly interested in sports during Junior High.

H. WORK

____ ____ 1. I had a job in Junior High that took more than 20 hours a week.

____ ____ 2. I had a job in Junior High that took more than 10 hours a week.

____ ____ 3. I had a full time summer job last summer.

____ ____ 4. I had a part time job last summer that took over 10 hours a week.

____ ____ 5. I did odd jobs during Junior High.

____ ____ 6. I wanted to work during Junior High but could not find a job.

____ ____ 7. I did not want a job during my Junior High days.

I. ELECTIVE OFFICES

____ ____ 1. I held an elective office during Junior High.

____ ____ 2. I was nominated for an elective office in Junior High but was not elected.

____ ____ 3. I would have been happy to have had an elective office during Junior High.

____ ____ 4. I did not particularly want an elective office in Junior High.

J. CHURCH

____ ____ 1. I was an officer in one of our church youth groups during Junior High.

____ ____ 2. I went to Sunday School and/or church each Sunday in Junior High.

____ ____ 3. I went to Sunday School and/or church about one half of the time during Junior High.

____ ____ 4. I occasionally went to Sunday School or church during Junior High.

K. SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

____ ____ 1. During Junior High I attended 4 or more parties in which at least 6 young people had a party in somebody's home.

____ ____ 2. I went to at least 4 Junior High dances.

____ ____ 3. I attended at least 4 parties at my church during Junior High.

True False

___ ___ 4. I had 2 or more dates last year.

___ ___ 5. I was not particularly interested in social activities during Junior High.

L. RECREATION GROUPS

During Junior High I attended the following groups: (Check twice (✓✓) those that you attended at least 6 times last year.)

YWCA ____

YMCA ____

Boy Scouts ____

Girl Scouts ____

Rainbow Girls ____

DeMolay ____

Others (please write in name)

____________ ____

____________ ____

____________ ____

M. TRAVEL

___ ___ 1. I traveled in more than 10 states during Junior High.

___ ___ 2. I traveled in more than 5 states during Junior High.

___ ___ 3. During Junior High I traveled in more than 2 states.

___ ___ 4. I traveled quite a lot within Illinois during Junior High.

___ ___ 5. During Junior High I traveled some within Illinois.

Appendix D. Rating Instruments

Work Adjustment Rating Scale

1. Seldom does satisfactory work

   Doesn't care what happens to him jobwise

   Holds jobs for short times and is fired

   Chronically unemployed or has not worked altho not in school

2. Chronic complainer, employer regards him as a malcontent; finds no job or working conditions to his liking

   Holds jobs longer than those rated 1 but eventually quits, is fired, or is regarded as an undesirable employee by his employer.

   Getting nowhere in a work career.

3. Steady, stable, but limited

   Relatively satisfied with work of this type and will likely stay on here indefinitely, or will take a similar job elsewhere.

   No particular drive to get ahead

   May have doubts about the future occupationally, but meanwhile is doing an adequate job where he is

4. Can expect limited advancement into supervisory or skilled job. Is moving ahead largely thru seniority.

   Likes his work.

   May have shifted jobs but each time has bettered his position with either better pay or more opportunities for advancement.

5. The individual has realistic plans for advancement in the future accompanied by realistic actions in the present.

   His employer thinks he will advance to a position of responsibility in the company

   Happy in his work.

   Has learned from every work experience, has a flair for this kind of work, feels comfortable in it, and is sure of promotions to a very responsible job.

   (Whenever possible college dropouts should be judged by their subsequent work experience.)

Job Category Rating Scale

1. No work experience or unemployed more than half the time since leaving school.

   Occasional odd jobs for pre-determined short periods, manual labor with no job security.

2. Manual labor with fairly good job security.

   Low paying-semi skilled jobs with little job security or opportunity for advancement. (These jobs require no previous education, training, or experience; few fringe benefits.)

3. Semi-skill/ed job in fairly stable or stable industry. Opportunity for pay increases and seniority, but few opportunities for promotion. (File clerk in an office.)

   Poor paying white collar jobs such as clerks in downtown stores.

   Military - routine assignment not involving a marketable skill.

4. Skilled job or concrete evidence of having taken successful step in this direction; a marketable skill with opportunity for limited advancement - bookkeepers, typists, apprentices, etc.

   Military special training in a marketable skill and advances in rating.

5. Special knowledge or skill including business judgement (or concrete evidence of movement in this direction.)

   Jobs leading toward positions of major responsibility, when the employer thinks the individual will achieve this goal.

EVALUATION OF MARRIAGES

Evaluate at 5 levels:

5, 4 - - Good. Give this rating to couples who are obviously well-mated in terms of cultural and religious background, and who are apparently getting along fairly well. Give it also to couples who are getting along well in spite of difficulties, such as husband in service. Pay attention to the comments by the wife on her satisfaction or dissatisfactions, devotion to husband, etc.

3 - Average. Give this rating to marriages which are going all right as far as we know; but for which we do not have much information. If we have a fair amount of information, it should indicate that the marriage is an average one. Neither spouse has regrets. Relatives do not complain about the marriage.

2, 1 - - Poor. Girl pregnant at time of marriage.
Evidence of quarrelling and threatened separation.
Application or plans for divorce.
Desertion.
Husband in jail.
Evidence of sexual promiscuity since marriage for wife or
Any 2 of these should make it a poor marriage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, Charles M., Combating the Dropout Problem, Chicago: Science Research Associates Inc., 1956.

2. Citizens' Committee on Children of New York City Inc., Children Absent from School, New York: The Committee, 1949.

3. Dillon, Harold C., "Early School Leavers," New York: National Child Labor Committee, Publication No. 401, October, 1949.

4. Jacobs, J. Smith, "Some Facts About School Dropouts," San Diego: Unpublished paper, San Diego County Public Schools, December, 1954.

5. Layton, Warren K., "Special Services for the Dropout and the Potential Dropout," New York: National Child Labor Committee, Publication No. 408, October, 1952.

6. Sheldon, Paul M., "Mexican Americans in Urban Public Schools--An Exploration of the Dropout Problem." Mimeo. Laboratory in Urban Culture, Occidental College, Los Angeles, California, 1958.

7. McCreary, William K. and Kitch, Donald E., "Now Hear Youth," Bulletin of the California State Department of Education, Vol. XXII, No. 9, October, 1953.

8. Smith, Harry, "Syracuse Youth Who Did Not Graduate." Research Division, Board of Education, Syracuse, New York.

9. Segel, David and Schwarm, Oscar J., "Retention in High Schools in Large Cities," Washington: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Bulletin 1957, No. 15.

10. Stone, Carol Larson, "High School Dropouts in a Rural County, Their Problems and Adjustments," Pullman: Washington Agriculture Experiment Stations, Institute of Agricultural Sciences, State College of Washington, Bulletin 565, March, 1956.

11. Work Conference on Life Adjustment Education, "Why Do Boys and Girls Drop Out of School, and What Can We Do About It?" Circular 269, Washington, D. C. : U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1953.

12. Lazare, Daniel, These Left Before Graduating, Tacoma-Pierce County Study of Education for Exceptional Children, Tacoma, Washington.

13. Ott, Conrad, Dropout Study, Jefferson County Pupil Personnel and Research Department, 1959; Louisville, Kentucky.

14. Arnholter, E. B., "School Persistence and Personality," *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 35; pp. 107-09, October, 1956.

15. Cantoni, L. J., "Stayins Get Better Jobs," *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 33; pp. 531-33, May, 1955.

16. Cook, E. S., *An Analysis of Factors Related to Withdrawal from School Prior to Graduation*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Georgia.

17. Engebretson, R. J. and Falk, H. A., *Dropout Study*. Office of Secondary and Vocational Education, St. Paul Public Schools, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1955.

18. Coster, John K.,"Attitudes Toward Schools of High School Pupils From Three Income Levels," *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 49, #2, 1958.

19.. Gragg, William L., *A Study of Factors Related to the Persistence of Pupils in Public Secondary Schools*. Ph. D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1950.

20. Dresher, R. H., "Factors in Voluntary Dropouts," *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 32: pp. 287-89, January, 1954.

21. Snepp, D. W., "Can We Salvage the Dropouts?" *Clearing House* 31: pp. 49-54, September, 1956.

22. Warner, W. Lloyd, Meeker, Marchia L., and Eells, Kenneth W., *Social Class in America*. New York: Science Research Associates 1949.

23. Van Duke, L. A., and Hoyt, K. B., *The Dropout Problem in Iowa High Schools*, Iowa State Department of Public Instruction, 1958.

24. Smith, G. Milton, *A Simplified Guide to Statistics*, New York: Rinehart and Co., 1946.

25. Wallis, W. A. and Roberts, H. V., *Statistics, A New Approach*, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.

26. McNemar, Quinn, *Psychological Statistics*, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1949.